

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Select Committee on the Postwar Military Policy. House Report No. 505 (pt. II). Report pursuant to House Resolution 465. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 502. An act to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2322. A bill to provide for the issuance of the Mexican Border Service Medal to certain members of the Reserve forces of the Army on active duty in 1916 and 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Military Affairs. House Joint Resolution 136. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment, management, and perpetuation of the Kermit Roosevelt fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 3101. A bill to amend section 601 (e) and (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3102. A bill to facilitate employment of necessary personnel in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3103. A bill to amend the Service-men's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 3104. A bill to amend the act of December 17, 1919, providing for the payment of 6 months' pay to dependents of officers or enlisted men whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of their own misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3105. A bill to amend section 5 (b) of the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, so as to require publication of facts regarding violations in cases of false advertising of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3106. A bill to create a Federal Civilian Retirement Administration and to transfer thereto the functions of the Civil Service Commission pertaining to civil-service-retirement activities; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 3107. A bill to provide for reducing eligible age from 65 to 60 under the provisions of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relative to the termination of the colonial system in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 237. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document the proceedings of the launching of the U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt*; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Res. 238. Resolution relative to the Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. Res. 239. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to study the proposal to establish a transportation system between North America and South America by way of Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 240. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the study authorized by House Resolution 239; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give immediate and favorable consideration to a revision and reclassification of the wage system of the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act as to provide that no divorce shall be granted by the courts of the Territory unless the applicant therefor shall have resided in the Territory for 1 year next preceding the application; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to allow Filipino residents to become naturalized citizens of the United States of America; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, Mr. PRICE of Florida introduced a bill (H. R. 3108) for the relief of Harvey Shields, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

515. By Mr. BIEMILLER: Petition of John L. May, of Milwaukee, Wis., requesting that a special investigating committee be appointed to conduct an investigation of the Veterans' Administration facility, Wood, Wis.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

516. By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of the Borough Council of Wilksburg, Pa., on the death of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on Memorials.

517. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of James G. Shea and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. Also, petition of A. Moll and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

519. Also, petition of Edward G. Wolff and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition

legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

520. Also, petition of Joseph A. Pons and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

521. Also, petition of M. Petkovich and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

522. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take the proper steps necessary to protect and preserve the New England lace industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

523. By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lansdowne, Pa., signed by 17 members, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

524. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Nations Committee of the San Fernando Valley, Van Nuys, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the Government of the United States to support House bill 2211 and Senate bill 540 and to do all in its power to make possible the Bretton Woods proposals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, April 16, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in Thy great mercy forgive our willful, blind, sorely wounded humanity for the havoc and desolation it has brought upon itself. We confess that we have a part in the tangled tragedy which blights the earth. Forbid that we should condemn the world and then stand unashamed and with false pride in the temple of prayer, thanking Thee that we are not as other men. We have offended against Thy holy laws; by our selfishness we have hindered the coronation of Thy purposes for all mankind; we have sought a solution for human wrongs which would leave ourselves unchanged. We have been unwilling to pay the cost of better things.

Forgive what we have been; help us to amend what we are; and in Thy spirit direct what we shall be: That Thou mayest come into the full glory of Thy creation in us and in all men. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 30, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; and

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2639) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DONNELL GILLIAM TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I now give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 10, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Donnell Gilliam, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of North Carolina, vice Isaac M. Meekins, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

HEARINGS ON THE SO-CALLED FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the coming hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee on the full employment bill, S. 380, will provide a democratic forum within which the basic issues on America's future economic policy can be fully explored. These hearings will be conducted in cooperation with the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, headed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It is a source of gratification to me that the Senator from Georgia has indicated that he will take part in the

hearings to the fullest extent that his time permits and that he has officially appointed a subcommittee of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee to sit with the Banking and Currency Committee. This subcommittee is composed of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. The value of the coming hearings will largely depend upon the extent to which the testimony is directed toward the basic issues involved in the maintenance of full employment and a steadily rising standard of living.

In this connection, I should like to call attention to an article in the spring number of the Harvard Business Review which analyzes the basic issues involved in the full employment bill. This article, entitled "The Proposed Full Employment Act," was written by Charles I. Gragg and Stanley F. Teele, both of whom are professors of business administration at the Harvard Business School.

The central issue raised by the full employment bill, according to the authors of this article, is "the extent to which the people of this Nation wish the Federal Government to assume responsibility for seeing to it that there are available opportunities for full employment."

The authors also point out another important issue involved in the bill, namely:

Do the people wish the Federal Government to take action in advance of unemployment crises or to wait until such crises have developed before dealing with the current situation?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Proposed Full Employment Act," to which I have just referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROPOSED FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT (By Charles I. Gragg and Stanley F. Teele)

On January 22, 1945, Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, on behalf of himself and Senators WAGNER, of New York, THOMAS, of Utah, and O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill, S. 380, entitled "A bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government." The bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which Senator WAGNER is chairman.

The purpose of this article is to sketch some of the background of this bill, to analyze its contents, and to point out some of the issues involved. No attempt will be made here to appraise the bill or to indicate conclusions. The authors believe that the business community and the public generally should approach this proposal with open minds and should seek to avoid the danger of closed minds which results from the prompt application of such labels as regimentation, totalitarianism, communism, or fascism. Equally urgent is the avoidance of the risk that the widespread acceptance of full employment as an ideal almost as important as international peace will distract many of us from carefully weighting the workability and desirability of specific proposals to that end.

THE GOAL OF HIGH OUTPUT

The high output of American industry in response to Government contracts during the war has dramatized to millions of our people the increase in productivity that has resulted from technological and organizational improvements over the years. The performance of the war period has set both business and labor to asking insistently: if we can marshal our mechanical and human resources so effectively during a war, why cannot we do the same thing during peace? There is widespread confidence, moreover, that our technological knowledge is great enough to provide for a generally high standard of material well-being—if we can find out how to assure demand for the use of our mechanical and human resources effectively and continuously.

The war began in the fall of 1939, in the midst of a period of mass unemployment in the United States. The contrast it brought has reinforced the focus of attention on mass unemployment as the principal interference with maintaining a high level of output. And because a high material standard of living is bound up with the maintenance of a high level of output, the question is raised of how we can correct such unemployment.

The question is a complicated one, to say the least. In any given period of time, for example, a considerable volume of unemployment is unavoidable. It necessarily results from the seasonal characteristics of some industries, from technological developments which require the transfer of workers from one activity to another, and from the preservation of the individual's opportunity to choose his own activity and to be idle while making a change dictated by his own preference. Unemployment from such causes as these is quite generally recognized now as an inevitable but relatively unimportant interference with high output.

There is, moreover, quite general recognition that, at all times, technological advance and other improvements in production present the opportunity for choice between more goods and services, on the one hand, and more leisure on the other hand. This factor also can interfere with raising the level of output, although over the years, through individual or group choice and through legislative enactment, the compromise between more goods and services and more leisure has repeatedly been worked out: more goods and services and more leisure have both been secured.

But whatever the complicating factors, mass involuntary unemployment resulting from cyclical fluctuations in business, stands out as a most important interference, direct or indirect, with high output. It is therefore natural that much attention among all elements of the population should center on the question of how best to minimize and perhaps eliminate mass unemployment resulting from cyclical fluctuations. The question is insistent. Business groups, such as the Committee for Economic Development and the great labor organizations, are asking the question and formally seeking for answers. Public opinion polls agree on the great underlying anxiety of people generally about this question. The specific proposal embodied in S. 380 should be considered against this background.

THE BILL

The history of S. 380 may be briefly stated. In August 1944, during the discussion of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, Mr. James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, submitted to the War Contract Subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee a legislative measure which required the Government to guarantee a capital investment each year of \$40,000,000,000. This particular proposal was examined by many of the executive departments and agencies at the request of the subcommittee,

and the objections raised led to the drafting of a wholly new measure by the subcommittee's staff. The resulting Full Employment Act of 1945 was printed in the year-end report of the war contracts subcommittee on December 18, 1944. As the result of comments received following this publication, the measure was substantially revised and introduced on January 22, 1945. The discussion in this article is based on the version introduced on that date.

The full text of S. 380 is printed as an appendix to this article. At this point, before going on with the analysis, in which only selected passages from the bill are quoted, the reader may wish to read the bill for himself.

As the authors of this article view S. 380, it may be divided into two principal parts. The first part of the bill is a declaration of policy, making explicit the role of the Federal Government in working out basic economic policies and procedures. The second part of the bill sets up an organizational framework and a set of procedures whereby the Federal Government would regularly appraise the basic economic problems that will presumably exist from time to time, and would take anticipatory action to meet those problems. The bill requires no fundamental changes in the structure of the basic institutions of our Government but provides for their adaptation to the task accepted in the declaration of policy.

The bill emphasizes the fact that our Federal Government includes both an executive branch and a legislative branch, and it spells out the responsibilities of each in this area. The bill is very definite in its assignment of responsibilities to Congress. This is in line with the current interest in revising congressional organization and procedures generally. Among other recent indications of this interest may be cited the Maloney-Monroney resolution calling for a reexamination of the congressional set-up and the recent report of the National Planning Association entitled "Strengthening the Congress."¹

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The essential points of the declaration of policy are a positive affirmation that it is national policy to foster free, competitive enterprise, and that it is national policy to assure the existence at all times of employment opportunities sufficient to make effective the right to work inherent in our Constitution and particularly in the Bill of Rights. The exact words of these two declarations in S. 380 are as follows:

"(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce and in the development of the natural resources of the United States:

"(b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, and remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right."

It should be emphasized that this declaration of policy does not seek to guarantee a particular job to any specific individual. Rather it stresses the existence of opportunities for employment of one sort or another. Nor does the declaration of policy set forth any single goal as to the number of job opportunities which should be available; it does not mention, for instance, any of the commonly discussed figures such as 60,000,000 or 55,000,000.

This policy declaration poses to the American people specifically the question: Does

the Nation wish the Federal Government to assume over-all responsibility for seeking to assure opportunities for full employment, or does the Nation wish to leave this responsibility to private business and local governments?

In considering this question we should recognize that the leaders of both major political parties have recently stated their belief that the Federal Government should assume this responsibility. This position was taken by President Roosevelt in his speech at Soldiers Field Stadium in Chicago on October 28, 1944. And Governor Thomas E. Dewey, in his speech at San Francisco on September 21, 1944, said: "Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise. * * * If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, then government can and must create job opportunities because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours. * * *"

We should perhaps also recognize that this same general point of view has been officially expressed in Great Britain by the white paper on employment policy issued by the Ministry of Reconstruction early in 1944. The white paper begins with the sentence, "The Government accept as one of their primary aims and responsibilities the maintenance of a high and stable level of employment after the war."²

The white paper deals with a variety of measures for stimulating and regulating capital expenditures by both private enterprise and public authorities and consumption expenditures by consumers. It puts considerable reliance for regulating consumption expenditures on varying the rate of contributions by employers under the system of social insurance.

Of course, the objective of "full employment" or "high and stable employment" may itself be challenged. Full employment may be considered not only as a means of bringing about high output but also as a means of sharing the output which is produced. The opportunity of a job for everyone able and willing to work may be considered important because the job is viewed as the sole basis on which the individual may share in the aggregate output. But, to be completely logical, a job is not necessarily the only basis on which the individual may share in aggregate output, and those preferring other bases (for example, socialism) will no doubt challenge the objective of full employment on these grounds.

Again, one may hold that, while "full employment" is a desirable objective, there are other even more desirable objectives with which full employment is at all times inconsistent. According to this concept, new progress in productivity is necessarily irregular, and the effort to eliminate the resulting cyclical fluctuations in business activity cannot fail to impede, if not prevent, progress. This line of reasoning leads to the position

² The white paper on employment policy is described in its foreword as follows:

"Unlike other papers on post-war problems which the Government have presented or are preparing, this is not primarily an outline of projected legislation. For employment cannot be created by act of Parliament or by Government action alone. Government policy will be directed to bringing about conditions favorable to the maintenance of a high level of employment; and some legislation will be required to confer powers which are needed for that purpose. But the success of the policy outlined in this paper will ultimately depend on the understanding and support of the community as a whole—and especially on the efforts of employers and workers in industry; for without a rising standard of industrial efficiency we cannot achieve a high level of employment combined with a rising standard of living."

that the Government should accept the responsibility for ameliorating the effects of cyclical fluctuations on individuals to the extent that "no one shall starve," but should go no further. This is a useful reminder of the fact that in the economic area there are many degrees of responsibility which the Government might or might not assume. At one extreme is the responsibility expressed in the phrase "no one shall starve." At the other extreme is complete responsibility for eliminating the business cycle. In between is a whole range of possibilities, including the responsibility which is limited to encouraging private enterprise.

Some analysts of S. 380 will argue that the bill goes all the way toward a centrally planned economy. The authors, although realizing that "economic planning" is capable of many definitions, do not believe that this bill, by intent or otherwise, does go all the way toward such a Government-planned national economy. In this measure, private planning by business itself is an essential prerequisite for whatever steps Government may take; that is, the bill calls for joint planning by both business and Government.

In the last analysis the people will decide the extent of the responsibility which they wish to assume collectively (that is, through the Federal Government) partly at least in terms of the costs, both material and emotional, incurred by such acceptance, and partly in terms of the specific way in which the responsibility is to be assumed.

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE

S. 380 does not undertake to set forth all the solutions for specific economic problems which will be encountered in the future. Rather, it calls for a periodic examination of the facts, provides the machinery to make decisions on how best to meet those particular facts at the particular time. The bill definitely proposes that this examination and the decisions resulting therefrom shall be anticipatory. The central purpose is to cause the Government to take advance action to maintain reasonably full employment, not to wait for large-scale unemployment to develop and then to take remedial action. The bill proposes, moreover, that the examination and resulting decisions shall not be piecemeal but shall be broad, even comprehensive, in their coverage.

The bill undertakes to provide the organizational structure and the procedures needed, in the light of changing circumstances, to reach the objective set forth in the declaration of policy. To put it in less formal language, the bill undertakes to say who does what. Four successive steps in the procedure may be distinguished. Action begins at the opening of each regular session of Congress, with the President's submission of a "National Production and Employment Budget" to Congress.

"FIRST STEP—WHO?"

"The President, acting through the Executive Office of the President with the advice and assistance of the members of his Cabinet, other heads of departments and establishments, and such advisory boards or representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments as he may deem advisable.

"FIRST STEP—WHAT?"

"(A) Estimates (a) the size of the labor force including the self-employed; (b) the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure needed to provide job opportunities for such a labor force; and (c) the aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure from all sources.

"(B) Recommends as follows:

"1. If estimates indicate a deficiency of jobs as compared with job seekers, he recommends

"(a) Steps to implement the policy that it is the "responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly

¹ National Planning Association, Planning Pamphlets No. 39, Strengthening the Congress, by Robert Heller (Washington, the Association, 1945).

arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure." Specifically, the President is to recommend "a general program for encouraging such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure, particularly investment and expenditure which will promote increased employment opportunities by private enterprise, as will prevent such deficiency to the greatest possible extent. The President shall also include in such Budget such recommendations for legislation relating to such program as he may deem necessary or desirable. Such program may include, but need not be limited to, current and projected Federal policies and activities with reference to banking and currency, monopoly and competition, wages and working conditions, foreign trade and investment, agriculture, taxation, social security, the development of natural resources, and such other matters as may directly or indirectly affect the level of non-Federal investment and expenditure."

"(b) If the President does not believe that the steps recommended in his preferred program outlined under (a) will provide opportunity for full employment, the President shall call for Federal investment and expenditure up to the level required to assure opportunities for full employment. "Such program shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate additional non-Federal investment and expenditure. Any such programs calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private concerns under contracts awarded in accordance with applicable laws, except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law." Such expenditures and investment shall not take the form of the operation of plants, factory, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government.

"2. If estimates indicate an excess of jobs as compared with job seekers, the President shall set forth in such budget a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocation, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both."

"SECOND STEP—WHO?"

"Joint Committee on the National Budget composed of the chairman and ranking minority members of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Banking, and Currency, Education, Labor, and Finance, and seven additional Members of the Senate; and the chairman and ranking minority Members of the House Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Labor, and Ways and Means, and seven additional Members of the House of Representatives. The committee will have a total of 30 members, 15 from the Senate and 15 from the House and will select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

"SECOND STEP—WHAT?"

"(A) Studies the National Budget transmitted to Congress.

"(B) Reports to the Senate and the House not later than March 1 of each year its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution set forth for the ensuing fiscal year, a general policy with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

"THIRD STEP—WHO?"

"Regular committees of Congress concerned with specific parts of the program, e. g. Ap-

propriations, Banking and Currency, and the like.

"THIRD STEP—WHAT?"

"Consider and report to their representative bodies specific legislation, including appropriations designed to carry out the general program recommended by the President and the Joint Committee on the National Budget. [Absolute final control of particular programs and appropriations is retained for the Congress and its regular committees by the following provision of the bill: 'Section 8. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as calling for or authorizing . . . (c) any change in the existing procedures on appropriations; or (d) the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this Act.']

"FOURTH STEP—WHO?"

"The President acting through the Executive Office of the President.

"FOURTH STEP—WHAT?"

"(A) 'May from time to time transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised estimates, information, programs, or legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or advisable in connection with the National Budget.'

"(B) 'Shall review quarterly all Federal investment and expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the current and anticipated level of non-Federal investment and expenditure warrants any change in the volume of such Federal investment and expenditure.'

"(C) 'Subject to any restrictions in the specific appropriation acts and statutes, the President may vary the rate of Federal investment and expenditure within the general framework.'

These steps may perhaps be summarized this way: The President is required to analyze the prospective economic situation and to submit to Congress his general analysis and specific recommendations—the national production and employment budget—for general study by a joint committee on the National Budget of both Houses of Congress. Specific measures and programs are then handled by regular standing committees of the two Houses. And, finally, the President is required continuously to review conditions within the period of the fiscal year or years for which the National Budget has been submitted.

Although the bill requires the President to include specific legislative proposals in the program which he submits to Congress, it is silent on the responsibility of the executive branch for preparing specific legislation to implement the recommendations of the National Budget after it has been considered and modified by the joint committee. Presumably, however, as in the present and recent past, the executive branch would assume considerable responsibility for preparing and presenting to the appropriate committees at least first drafts of specific legislation.

MAJOR ISSUES

It should be evident that the considerations pertinent to this bill are not solely economic in character; economic analysis in any narrow sense will not arrive at a complete appraisal. The issues suggested in this article are therefore of various types and by no means include all those which will occur to the specialist in economics.

The central issue, as has already been indicated, is the extent to which the people of this nation wish the Federal Government to assume responsibility for seeing to it that there are available opportunities for full employment. With respect to this particular proposal of Government responsibility, however, there are certain other issues on which attention should be focused.

Questions of principle. First of all, there is a group of important issues involving questions of principle:

(1) Do the people wish the Federal Government to take action in advance of unemployment crises or to wait until such crises have developed before dealing with the current situation? S. 380 calls for continuous study by the executive and legislative branches of the Government leading to decisions, at any given time, to take some action, or to take no action to affect the level of business activity and employment. One alternative would be to try to define some kind of critical point, say, 5,000,000 unemployed, and require that analysis and action occur only when such a critical point has been reached. Another alternative, still within the framework of acceptance of responsibility by the Federal Government, would be to analyze and act only when the consensus, however arrived at, indicated that analysis and action were needed.

It should especially be noted in connection with this question that the bill directs the President, if his estimates indicate an excess of jobs, to recommend measures for "preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both." Wisdom and fortitude will surely be required of the President who recommends measures to take the top off a boom.

A closely related phase of the question concerns the timing for stopping programs previously recommended by the President and put into effect by the Congress. An important portion of each succeeding National Budget would necessarily be concerned with the continuance or discontinuance of programs previously initiated.

It should also be noted that a partial alternative to either advance planning or remedial action recommends itself to some: the establishment of powerful automatic measures that come into action without decision by any agency at the time they are needed. A variety of possibilities in the areas of taxation, social-security contributions, and the building industry are suggested.

(2) Would the organization and procedures set forth in S. 380 serve to strengthen or to weaken the spontaneous pressure for high and stable employment among job givers and job seekers? There are many different aspects of this question. In the first place, there is the possible effect on business attitude of "official" estimates of the proper level of business activity. To what extent, for instance, would an advance estimate of low activity induce business to pull in its horns and make the estimate come true? Or, would such an estimate convince many business enterprises that the period would be one in which expansion would be economical and desirable?

Another aspect of this question involves the importance to business psychology of a balanced financial budget. This aspect leads to the question: what analysis is needed to indicate the limits, if any, which should be placed on programs of Federal spending to avoid job deficiency? Again, one needs to consider whether the requirement that Federal expenditures take the form of contracts with private employers and the ban on the operation of plants and factories by the Federal Government would sufficiently reassure job givers that profit prospects were not going to be unduly interfered with by Federal competition.

Workability: In addition to these important questions of principle, there are a variety of questions affecting workability which need to be thoroughly explored. As has been emphasized in this article, S. 380 is essentially an organization framework and a set of procedures for analyzing and taking action with

respect to basic economic problems. These procedures are set forth in broad terms only.

(1) What problems are involved in getting the required estimates? This question may be allowed to stand for a great many in the area of the statistical techniques involved. Such problems as translating data on gross national products to aggregate levels of employment will call for intensive study. The definition of what constitutes employment and unemployment, and how to deal in the estimates with part-time employment, will also prove troublesome.

It is undoubtedly true that these war years have seen a tremendous increase in the amount of information available about industrial activity and in the creation of machinery for securing it continuously. It is also true that during the last few decades many people have been studying the problems involved in forecasting. And although these efforts have not been uniformly successful, they have resulted in the accumulation of the considerable body of experience and technique. Nevertheless, the task of working out the statistical techniques for this particular kind of estimating will be large and difficult.

(2) To what extent would the length of time between estimates and actual operations—12 to 24 months or more—lead to overestimates or underestimates? Although the procedure set forth in the bill calls for continuous reexamination and the revision of decisions as conditions change, the time factors do suggest some very serious difficulties.

(3) How should the executive branch be organized to provide for bringing together most effectively the several kinds and types of estimates? The bill provides that the responsibility shall rest on the President working through his Executive Office with the advice of Cabinet members, department heads, and such other advisors as he wishes. This top organization will need to be supplemented by an extensive field organization if the estimates are to be developed from the "grass roots," i. e., from thousands and thousands of individual enterprises, and are not to be strictly products of the "Ivory tower." And it will take well-developed procedures to gather from all elements in our economy the facts about current conditions and the estimates concerning prospective conditions.

(4) The questions that have just been raised all deal with the operation of securing estimates. After estimates are secured and general recommendations based thereon have been submitted for study and appraisal in an over-all way by the joint committee, there remains the task of specific legislation and administrative execution to implement the general program. And the program as a whole will be only as good as the legislative and administrative performance.

Suppose, for example, that a principal part of the President's program, recommended by the President and approved in principle by the joint committee, is a major revision of the tax structure. Whether or not this program actually is put into effect depends, in the first place, on the action of the appropriate regular standing committees and, in the second place, on the action of Congress as a whole. The division of responsibility for drafting specific legislation to implement the general program, as among the executive branch, the joint committee and the regular standing committees will have much effect on the actual workability of the proposal, and it has not yet been fully thought out and accepted.

Success will depend, in a very real sense, on specific legislation dealing with the policies and the appropriations and expenditures needed to implement the encouraging of private enterprise (i. e., on the "consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs" which are called for), and on the

administrative policies and procedures in the same area.

(5) Most Federal legislation of any considerable significance emerges as the reconciliation of a variety of sectional, group, and party interests. This fact is particularly true of legislation in the economic area, and there is little in the provisions of S. 380 to change this situation. In other words, the specific legislation to implement the recommendations of the executive branch, as approved or modified by the joint congressional committee, will be a product of compromise among many conflicting groups. The question therefore arises whether such far-reaching responsibilities in the economic area can safely be entrusted to such a process of reconciling and compromising conflicting political, sectional, and group interests. In considering this question one must recognize, of course, that in some way reconciliation of diverse interests and points of view must be achieved in a democratic society.

(6) With respect to the second type of program which the President is to recommend to meet job deficiencies, namely, proposals for Federal Government investment and expenditure, many questions about workability come to mind.

Among these may be mentioned: What guides will be required for decisions on job deficiency programs in especially depressed localities? As is emphasized in the British white paper on employment policy and as we know from our own past experience, at many times unemployment is patchy and heavily concentrated in particular areas.

This question is, of course, closely tied to the next one. What, if any, impediments to labor mobility will need to be dealt with in working out Federal Government investment and expenditure programs? There are impediments arising from special skills and training, employer-employee agreements, wage differences, geographic preferences, environmental or customary factors, tenure of jobs, and others. Perhaps of particular importance in the years ahead is the question of how job deficiency programs involving Federal investment and expenditure can be administered in such a way as to avoid interferences with wage and other working agreements.

Reliance on Government contracts: One last over-all question deserves special attention. The procedure outlined in this bill calls for the periodic analysis of the prospective causes of difficulty together with efforts to deal with those particular causes in advance. It singles out, however, one specific measure as the prime residual device, namely, the placing of Government contracts; that is to say, when the policies and programs recommended by the President are not considered likely to be sufficient, the placing of Government contracts is the one measure called for—the sole reliance.

It should be noted that, whereas the volume of private contracts is limited to those for which the calculation of prospective profits is favorable, the volume of Government contracts would, in view of the prohibitions on Government operation of plants contained in the bill, be limited not by profit calculations but only by the requirements for employment. The question may properly be raised whether this particular device should not be included simply as one of those which the President may recommend in the light of particular circumstances along with all the other kinds of measures to deal with the prospective situation.

CONCLUDING NOTE

A major problem of a democracy in reaching decisions in complex and important situations is the difficulty of focusing attention on specific concrete issues which can be resolved one way or the other. There is frequently a tendency for issues to become confused and diverse in the minds of the people

and for irrelevant issues to bulk very large. While there are serious dangers in oversimplification of complicated problems, it is the opinion of the authors that one of the principal functions of leaders in a democracy is to work strenuously to pose questions to the people in a form that permits or facilitates decisions. S. 380 makes a contribution in this direction by providing an effective focal point for discussion and study.

Although the ultimate destiny of this bill—its acceptance, modification, or rejection—is uncertain, nevertheless the bill already is well serving the function of focusing attention on an important public policy. The public hearings which no doubt will be held by congressional committees on this bill should provide for a full and well-rounded consideration of all kinds of opinions, judgments, and recommendations. There is ample evidence, from individuals, groups, and institutions, public and private, that under the stimulus provided by this proposed legislation, the problem of full employment is being studied on a nationwide basis, making possible integrated conclusions with respect to it.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 406 aliens whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

APRIL PROGRESS REPORT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Surplus Property Board, stating that the April progress report of the Board, to be transmitted pursuant to law, will be transmitted at a later date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RELIEF OF G. F. ALLEN, CHIEF DISBURSING OFFICER, AND CERTAIN OTHER OFFICERS OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, and certain other officers and former officers of the Treasury Department for certain suspensions, disallowances, and unavailable items in their accounts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A letter from the Director of the Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting, pursuant to law, his third report on war-contract terminations and settlements, for the quarter ended March 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

COPIES OF LAWS PASSED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF TARIFF COMMISSION CONCERNING CERTAIN PRODUCTS AND THE RATIO OF IMPORTS IN RELATION THERETO (S. Doc. No. 33)

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 341 (78th Cong.) a final report on import trade

of the United States and production of related items (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance, and printed under the order heretofore agreed to.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth quarterly report of that agency, for the quarter ended December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RESTORATION OF PUBLIC LANDS, HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore certain land under the control of the Hawaiian Homes Commission to its previous status as public land under the control of the Territory of Hawaii (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF AMERICAN LEGION FINANCES

A letter from the director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the audit of the finances of the American Legion for the calendar year ended December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, for the Civil Aeronautics Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 38

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to adopt H. R. 2032 and H. R. 2033 in furtherance of preventing beach erosion

"Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States two measures designed to aid in the protection of beaches along the shores of the United States, which measures will shortly be heard before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors; and

"Whereas the first of these measures, H. R. 2032, authorizes general shore-line investigations, with a view to preventing shore erosion by waves and currents and to determining the most suitable methods for the protection, restoration, and development of bathing beaches, the cost of such investigations to be borne wholly by the United States; and

"Whereas the second of these measures, H. R. 2033, authorizes Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property, declaring it to be the policy of the United States to assist in the construction, but not the maintenance, of works for the improvement and protection against erosion of the shores of the United States that are owned by States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, provided that the Federal contribution toward the construction of protective works shall not in any case exceed one-third of the total cost; and

"Whereas the purposes sought to be accomplished by these measures are of particular interest to the coastal State of California, its political subdivisions, and its people in that thereby damage to public property may be prevented and healthful recreation may be promoted and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the

Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2032 and H. R. 2033 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to the investigation and protection of beaches; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to Mr. J. Spencer Smith, president of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, 1060 Broad Street, Newark, N. J., and to Mr. George P. Larsen, executive secretary of the Shoreline Planning Association of California, Inc., 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Resolution 177

"Resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact H. R. 1490, awarding a Distinguished Service Cross to Tony Siminoff

"Whereas on February 12, 1899, during the action near Jaro, P. I., Pvt. Tony Siminoff, of the Eighteenth Regiment, United States Infantry, did distinguish himself by meritorious conduct in action involving actual conflict with the enemy in that he rendered first aid to Lt. F. C. Bolles, commander of Company F of said regiment, and carried him from the field of battle; and

"Whereas Tony Siminoff merits a suitable award for his courage and valor in action: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact H. R. 1490 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, awarding a Distinguished Service Cross to Tony Siminoff, veteran of the Philippine Insurrection; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby authorized and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution

"Whereas the tax laws of the Territory of Hawaii apply to all compensation paid for services performed within the Territory irrespective of the domicile of the taxpayer, and under said laws it is contemplated that domiciliaries of the Territory of Hawaii who are absent from the Territory may be taxed by the States in which they perform services, in which event the Territory does not tax such domiciliaries upon their earnings outside of the Territory; and

"Whereas it is proper and desirable that duplicate taxation be avoided and the sentiment of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii is that the proper method of avoiding such duplicate taxation is by the method used by the Territory of Hawaii, that is, the method of exemption earnings of domiciliaries if and to the extent that the same earnings already have been taxed by the jurisdiction in which the services were performed; and

"Whereas it further is the view of this legislature that the State or Territory in which compensation is earned should be recognized to have the prior right of taxation inasmuch as, first, taxes are more readily collectible in the place in which the taxpayer actually is to be found and in many instances the domiciliary jurisdiction will not be able to collect taxes from its citizens who are absent from the State or Territory and may remain absent

for several years; and, second, the presence of workers within a State or Territory increases the cost of government therein whether or not they become citizens of such jurisdiction, and it is not fair to require the citizens of such jurisdiction to bear the cost of government for the noncitizens; and

"Whereas in no event should it be provided that the compensation of Federal employees who are working outside of their State or Territory of domicile shall be taxable solely by the domiciliary jurisdiction, thereby leading to tax evasion by such employees, by reason of their absence from the domiciliary jurisdiction; nor is such a provision for exclusive jurisdiction in one State necessary to avoid duplicate taxation, since duplicate taxation can be avoided by any State or Territory by a provision in its tax law for deduction from the tax base of income upon which a tax has been actually paid to another State or Territory, or by a provision for a credit against the tax on account of taxes actually paid to another State or Territory: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is respectfully requested and urged to amend H. R. 534 and any other bill presented to the Congress, relating to duplicate taxation of Federal employees, so as to provide that:

"1. The State or Territory in which the compensation is earned by a Federal employee shall have the prior right to tax such compensation; and

"2. The domiciliary jurisdiction may tax such compensation if the laws thereof provide for deduction from the tax base of income upon which a tax has been actually paid to the State or Territory wherein it was earned, or for a credit against the domiciliary tax on account of taxes actually paid to the State or Territory in which such compensation was earned; be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officer, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, of each of the Houses of Congress, to the chairman of the Committee on Territorial Affairs of the Senate of the Congress, to the chairman of the Committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General of the United States."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Immigration:

"House Concurrent Resolution 39

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to amend section 703 of title 8 of the United States Code Annotated so as to extend the right to become a naturalized citizen to Polynesian persons or persons of Polynesian descent; and be it further

"Resolved, That authenticated copies hereof be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States of America, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

"House Concurrent Resolution 53

"Whereas the Territorial Filipino Council, an association of delegates from the various plantation communities situated in the various islands in the Territory of Hawaii, has, in meeting assembled, on the 30th day of March 1945 selected Jose E. Bulatao, Phillip Gamponia, Juan S. Regala, Domingo Los Banos, Benjamin Ayson, and Mrs. Josephine

Gamponia as its duly elected representatives for the purpose of proceeding to Washington, D. C., to personally petition the Members of the United States Congress for the speedy enactment of such legislation which will give to Filipino residents now residing in the Territory of Hawaii and elsewhere in the United States of America the privilege of being naturalized as American citizens; and

"Whereas said representatives of the Territorial Filipino Council are expected to proceed to Washington, D. C., on or about May 15, 1945, for the purpose above-mentioned; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii has adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to amend the naturalization laws in such manner as to provide that Filipino residents may become citizens of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That it heartily endorses the mission of the duly elected representatives of the Territorial Filipino Council to proceed to Washington, D. C., to intercede in behalf of the Filipino people residing in the Territory of Hawaii and elsewhere in the United States of America, to the end that said Filipino residents may be allowed the privilege of becoming naturalized citizens of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to the Filipino Resident Commissioner at Washington, D. C., and to the Territorial Filipino Council."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 36

"Whereas on December 7, 1941, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii did call out the Territorial Militia and did authorize the Adjutant General of the Territory of Hawaii to organize and constitute an Hawaii Territorial Guard; and

"Whereas on the same date the Territorial Director of Civilian Defense ordered the Adjutant General, Territory of Hawaii, placed in command of all R. O. T. C. units on the island of Oahu, and did by authority of the Governor of Hawaii order all members of the University of Hawaii R. O. T. C. unit to mobilize at the University of Hawaii and stand by for further instructions; and

"Whereas said R. O. T. C. unit, University of Hawaii, did mobilize and was on said date, December 7, 1941, enlisted and activated as a part of the Hawaii Territorial Guard under enemy fire; and

"Whereas on December 11, 1941, said Hawaii Territorial Guard was placed under the command of the Department Provost Marshal, United States Army; and

"Whereas on December 26, 1941, said Hawaii Territorial Guard was placed under the command of the commanding general, Department of Hawaii, United States Army; and

"Whereas said Hawaii Territorial Guard did serve under the command of the said commanding general, Department of Hawaii, United States Army, occupy the same trenches and foxholes, eat the same food, sleep under the same shelter, go to the same hospital, wear the same uniform, use the same weapons, and perform the same duty as Federal armed forces, and it was released by order of the commanding general, Hawaiian Department, United States Army, in letter dated April 26, 1942, and directed to return to Territorial control; and

"Whereas the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War of the United States, has ruled that—

"The records of the National Guard Bureau indicate that the University of Hawaii R. O. T. C. unit served as part of the Hawaii Territorial Guard, which was organized under section 61 of the National Defense Act, as amended (acts of Oct. 21, 1940, 54 Stat. 1206; Aug. 18, 1941, 55 Stat. 628; 32 U. S. C. 194). This section provides expressly,

"That such forces shall not be called, ordered, or in any manner drafted, as such, into the military service of the United States; * * *

"The Governor of the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941, ordered the Territorial Guard into the active service of the Territory. In view of the statutory provision and the order of the Governor, mentioned above, service performed under General Order No. 44, Office of the Military Governor, dated December 26, 1941, cannot be construed as Federal service. * * *: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully petitioned to enact such legislation as is necessary to correct the status of said members of the Hawaii Territorial Guard so as to secure for them the just recognition as soldiers of the armed forces of the United States during World War No. 2; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

"House Concurrent Resolution 25

"Whereas the Hawaiian Organic Act as first passed in the year 1900 provided that persons applying for divorces in the courts of the Territory must have resided in the Territory twice as long as is required for establishing a residence in Hawaii for any other purpose; and

"Whereas the reason for such requirement, if any, no longer exists; and

"Whereas the rights and interests of the public and of individuals will still be amply protected even if the time required for acquiring a residence in the Territory for purposes of obtaining a divorce should be reduced: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, requested to so amend the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act as to provide that no divorce shall be granted by the courts of the Territory unless the applicant therefor shall have resided in the Territory for 1 year next preceding the application; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 63

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to provide wage credits on the social-security accounts of members of the armed forces during their period of service

"Whereas by the end of the war there will be approximately 15,000,000 men and women in the armed forces of the United States and

Wisconsin's share will be approximately 300,000; and

"Whereas most of these men and women will have lost from 1 to 4 years or even longer from the accumulation of benefits provided by the social-security law; and

"Whereas this will effect a real loss in the benefits to be received at the time of retirement inasmuch as such benefits are dependent upon contributions by both employee and employer; and

"Whereas the social-security law is wholly a Federal program; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the people of Wisconsin manifested in their respective representatives in the legislature that the returning veteran justly deserves and is entitled to fair and generous treatment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress to enact with all convenient speed, appropriate legislation providing that men and women in the armed forces shall receive appropriate wage credits on their social-security accounts for their period of military service; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and to the clerk of each House of the Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and enact legislation providing compensation to John J. Doherty, an Indian, for injuries sustained by reason of his unlawful removal from the Bad River Indian Reservation by Government agents

"Whereas John J. Doherty, and Indian whose present post-office address is 425 East Kilbourn Avenue, Milwaukee 2, Wis., contends that in 1909 when a bona fide member of and living with his family on the Bad River Indian Reservation in Wisconsin, being enrolled and allotted, he was under sections 2147 and 2149 of the Revised Statutes of the United States unlawfully removed from said reservation by Government agents to his damage in the sum of \$6,000; and

"Whereas the said John J. Doherty further contends that in an action in the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin in an action wherein the United States of America was complainant and the said John J. Doherty as defendant was charged under section 2148 of said Revised Statutes with having returned to said reservation in violation of the order so removing him, the said court on January 31, 1910, ordered the said John J. Doherty discharged on the grounds that the Government made out no case; and

"Whereas said contentions of John J. Doherty are supported by the court of said order and a warranty deed dated September 10, 1909, recorded in volume 97 of miscellaneous records on page 498 of the Ashland County, Wis., registry wherein Catherine James Doherty and John J. Doherty, her husband, convey to Mary Twobirds certain land therein described and allegedly within the limits of said reservation; and

"Whereas it appearing that another Indian, one Frank Murray, by congressional act in 1928 was compensated for injuries sustained by reason of a similar removal occurring at or about the same time; and

"Whereas, such removal of John J. Doherty if unlawful, was contrary to the

dignity of the State of Wisconsin and disturbed the tranquillity of the citizens of said State contrary to the guaranties of the Constitution of the State of Wisconsin and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to consider a bill like or similar to H. R. 3718 of 1939 providing compensation to the said John J. Doherty for injuries sustained by reason of such alleged illegal removal and to make thorough investigation into said contentions of John J. Doherty and, if found to be true and correct, to enact such bill into law; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of the Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the general assembly of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.)

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Joint Resolution 967

"Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make the necessary arrangements to provide that the official war films of World War No. 2 may be shown throughout all cities and towns of this State lest we forget too easily the horrors of war and the ruthlessness of our enemies

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are respectfully requested to make the necessary arrangements to provide that the official war films of World War No. 2 may be shown throughout all cities and towns of this State lest we forget too easily the horrors of war and the ruthlessness of our enemies; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 219

"Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take the proper steps necessary to protect and preserve the New England lace industry

"Whereas the American lace manufacturing industry suffered very serious difficulties as a result of tariff reductions effectuated under the trade agreement with France which became effective June 15, 1936; and

"Whereas importations of French laces increased in some cases, by over 3,300 percent of the 3-year average immediately preceding the French treaty; and

"Where, save for the fall of France in 1940, the American lace industry would have been completely annihilated, and it is indeed a sad commentary for the industry to realize that it was abandoned by its Government, and owes its existence today only through the actions of our enemy in bringing about the capitulation of France; and

"Whereas, with current Government expressions embracing free trade, the lace-workers' post-war lot is not an encouraging one: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby urgently requested to take the proper

steps necessary to protect and preserve the New England lace industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

"House Joint Resolution 970

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the matching by the Federal Government of certain State grants for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind

"Whereas in the supplemental message of His Excellency to the general assembly, March 29, 1945, it is stated that the State government is paying approximately 54 percent and the Federal Government only 46 percent of the total expenditures for old-age assistance; that the State government is paying approximately 75 percent and the Federal Government only 25 percent of the total expenditure for aid to dependent children; and

"Whereas in the event that the Federal Government participated currently on the basis of 50 percent of all expenditures, with respect to old-age assistance this would represent a saving to the State of more than \$100,000; and

"Whereas it undoubtedly was never the intention of Congress, when it passed the Social Security Act, to place an increasingly greater burden upon the States than was shared by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to work for increased Federal participation in the three-State programs, viz, old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; the elimination of the maximum provision with respect to aid to dependent children payments; Federal participation in medical care payments paid directly by the State agency to hospitals, physicians, or other practitioners until such time as a medical-insurance program has been provided; Federal participation, probably upon a 50-50 basis, in general public assistance; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Resolution 998

"Joint resolution requesting the Department of State of the United States Government to act favorably upon the requests for the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and the affording of representation at the San Francisco Conference to the Jewish people

"Whereas the platforms of both major political parties in the last Presidential election contained planks urging the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and

"Whereas the late departed President of the United States reiterated his approval of that policy but 2 weeks before his untimely death, stating 'that position I have not changed and shall continue to seek to bring about its early realization'; and

"Whereas the Jewish people, the world over, were the very first to feel the barbaric heel of the Nazi war lords, and have, through the

years since the rise of Hitler, been subjected to every form of inhuman torture; and

"Whereas it is reported that the United States Government is to submit to the San Francisco Conference, opening on April 25, a fully matured plan for dealing with the complicated subject of the mandated territories, which includes Palestine: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sentiment of this general assembly that the Department of State of the United States of America act favorably upon the requests for the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and that appropriate representation at the forthcoming San Francisco Conference be afforded the Jewish people; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Resolution 881

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give the utmost consideration to the recommendation of the Rhode Island General Assembly that a member of the armed forces of the United States of America, representing the men who have been doing the actual fighting, shall be given a place at and shall be allowed to sit in upon the Peace Conference

*"Whereas the men of the armed forces of the United States of America have had to take the brunt of the actual battle fighting and the bitter cruelty of war in the long, long road to victory and for that very reason every consideration should be given their opinion in the matter of what shall constitute the right kind*of peace: Now, therefore, be it*

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to give the utmost consideration to the recommendation of the Rhode Island General Assembly that a member of the armed forces of the United States of America, representing the men who have engaged in the actual fighting, shall be given a place at and shall be allowed to sit in upon the peace conference; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the Record three joint resolutions passed by the Legislature of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, printed in the Record.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Assembly Joint Resolution 34

Joint resolution relating to memorializing the O. P. A. to equalize the purchase of butter and oleomargarine

Whereas in view of the controversy between the users of oleomargarine and the

users of butter and in view of the apparent handicap under which butter is marketed as compared with that of oleomargarine; and

Whereas the present apportionment of points as to butter and oleomargarine has resulted in a feeling of the users of butter that an injustice has been done them; and

Whereas it is felt that the Office of Price Administration should reduce the points so that the users of butter, many of whom are the parents of many in our armed forces, may be able to avail themselves of obtaining butter without working an undue hardship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Office of Price Administration is respectfully requested to reduce the points required in the purchase at retail of butter so as to more nearly equalize the number of points required for butter and oleomargarine; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and to each Wisconsin Member of Congress.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also presented a resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

Assembly Joint Resolution 27

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to abolish the poll tax

Whereas 10,000,000 citizens of the United States are presently deprived of their gift of free suffrage by poll-tax laws in eight States which impose upon the exercise of the elective franchise limitations neither contemplated nor condoned by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas taking advantage of the inability of these 10,000,000 citizens, both Negro and white, to express themselves politically by participating in the choice of their representatives in government, both State and Federal, a few have been able to perpetuate themselves in office and, heedless of the needs and wishes of the people in their districts, have refused to recognize the grave perils that endanger our country and seek to disrupt the unity of our country and the mobilization of all our forces for the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas at a time when the morale and strength of the people of this Nation are needed increasingly if it is to survive, it is a dangerous inconsistency to continue to deprive any section of them of their democratic rights, to preserve which this war is being fought; but rather it is necessary to draw all men and women, no matter what their race, creed, color, or economic position, into full participation in the struggle for victory; and

Whereas the continuation of the poll tax in free America furnishes propaganda for the Axis to the great mass of colonial peoples who are fighting with us in this war for their freedom; and

Whereas the abolition of the poll tax will enable these 10,000,000 citizens to enter fully into their rights and duties as American citizens, and will, at the same time weaken those forces who place petty self-interest and personal power above the need for complete mobilization for victory and will strengthen national unity and morale: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to speedily enact legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to

the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also presented a resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ordered to lie on the table:

Assembly Joint Resolution 57

Joint resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to adopt and approve a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as major general

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States Senate Joint Resolution 34, authorizing the posthumous award to the late Col. William Mitchell of a commission as major general; and

Whereas it is a fitting tribute to the memory of William Mitchell that this award be made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin respectfully memorialize Congress to expedite the adoption of Senate Resolution 34, and the President to approve the adoption of said resolution; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also presented a resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ATTENDANCE OF VETERANS AT FUTURE CONFERENCES FOR WORLD PEACE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the New Hampshire State Legislature relating to the attendance of veterans at future conferences for world peace.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution relating to the participation by representatives of members of the armed forces at meetings of the governments of the United Nations

Whereas it is of the utmost importance that peace of the United Nations be a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the casualties of this global war have thus far exceeded those of any war in which our Nation has ever been involved, and our fighting forces have won the admiration of our country for their courage and valor; and

Whereas in every war it is the youth who give their blood and lives and make the greatest sacrifices; and

Whereas, the men who have gone through the horrors of battle should have a voice in making the peace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we ask our Congressmen and Senators in Washington to do all in their power to see that representatives of the veterans of this war, including officers and enlisted men who have had combat service and some of whom were less than 30 years of age when chosen as delegates, be at all future conferences for world peace; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Congressmen and Senators in Washington and to the President of the United States.

RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF POLAND

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a concurrent resolution relative to the rights of the people of Poland adopted by the New Hampshire State Legislature.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the inherent right of the people of Poland, as well as the people of other small nations, to determine the form and kind of their own government

Whereas the circumstances surrounding the disposition and placement of the territorial boundary lines of the Republic of Poland, and of other small European nations, as well as the manner in which the people of these small nations shall be permitted to determine the kind and form of their own government, give rise to serious concern as to whether the inherent rights of these peoples shall be safeguarded; and

Whereas all peoples throughout the entire world are fundamentally entitled to self-determination of the manner in which they shall be governed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That we look with concern upon conditions in Europe which presently are determining the location of the territorial boundary lines of the Republic of Poland, as well as those of other small nations, and, therefore, respectfully urge and petition the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the fact that the matter of territorial boundary lines is of universal concern and a proper subject for determination as a result of conferences between the United Nations as a whole rather than as the result of the decision of a single member thereof, and, further, that the matter of the form and kind of government to be enjoyed by any group of people is a matter for self-determination rather than by arbitrary decision of another government; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and petition the Congress of the United States to take whatever action it shall deem necessary in its deliberations to restore unto the people of all small nations all of their just rights and privileges; and be it further

Resolved, Copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this State.

DESIGNATION OF PHILADELPHIA AS THE PEACE CENTER OF THE WORLD—RESOLUTION OF THE DELAWARE STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have before me a communication from the secretary of state of Delaware with which there is enclosed a copy of Senate

Concurrent Resolution No. 28 adopted by the Delaware State Legislature asking that Philadelphia be made the new capital of the world for peace. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution and that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Library, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 28
Concurrent resolution concerning a world capital of peace

Whereas the gravest question the world will face once hostilities are concluded will be the establishment of a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas an international declaration of independence must be drawn enunciating those eternal principles which are the priceless heritage today of our own America; and

Whereas to write the new declaration of independence, a conference of 39 United Nations has been summoned to assemble in San Francisco on April 25, 1945, upon which conference will devolve the most solemn task that men have ever faced—the writing of a pact of peace, and also the location of a world capital of peace; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Delaware (the House of Representatives thereof concurring therein), That the city of Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, the city where America's Declaration of Independence was written, the first Capital of the United States, should become the world capital of peace, where a theme-center of a mall, beautifully landscaped, and stretching from Independence Hall, should be dedicated as the peace center of the world; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, and to each of the Senators and to the Representatives of the State of Delaware in the Congress of the United States.

ELBERT N. CARVEL,
President of the Senate.

CHESTER V. TOWNSEND, Jr.,
Speaker of the House.

Approved April 18, 1945:

WARREN W. BACON,
Governor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the Texas Legislature has sent to me copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 adopted by both branches of the Texas Legislature. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for printing in the RECORD and reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

Whereas in the State of Texas there are located two unused army posts, Fort Ringgold near Rio Grande City, and Fort Clark near Brackettville, which have recently been abandoned for all military purposes by the United States Army; and

Whereas the State of Texas at this time faces an acute housing shortage at the var-

ious eleemosynary institutions within the State as no new building have been, or can be, constructed during the emergency of war; and

Whereas there are reported to be more than 30,000 cases of infectious tuberculosis in Texas not being hospitalized, more than 500 such cases existing in one South Texas County, particularly among our Latin-American citizens; and

Whereas the State, while not responsible for all of these people, should provide facilities for the indigent who are unable to provide medical care for themselves; and

Whereas the two State tuberculosis sanatoriums at Kerrville and Carlsbad are filled to capacity at this time, with many tubercular patients acutely needing hospitalization, without hospital facilities available, and as a result are spreading this dread disease; and

Whereas all State-operated facilities for the care, education, and support of mentally handicapped children are filled to capacity with a long waiting list seeking admission into such institutions; and

Whereas the two aforesaid forts would provide places where these eleemosynary needs could be cared for immediately; and

Whereas should the legislature at this time appropriate sufficient funds with which to construct new buildings at the existing eleemosynary institutions, materials with which to construct such buildings could not be obtained due to the present war conditions; and

Whereas should the Congress of the United States authorize the transfer of Fort Ringgold and Fort Clark, together with the lands pertaining thereto, to the State of Texas, the property could be placed into immediate use with a small reconversion cost and thus the pressing needs of the present time could be met: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas and the House of Representatives concurring, That the Representatives in Congress from the State of Texas and the United States Senators from Texas be respectfully requested to submit a bill to Congress providing that Fort Ringgold and Fort Clark, together with all lands belonging thereto, be transferred to the State of Texas for use in eleemosynary service; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each such Texas Representative in Congress and the United States Senators from Texas with the request that the Texas delegation meet at the earliest time possible and take proper steps in getting passed through Congress said bill transferring said forts to the State of Texas.

WORLD ORGANIZATION OF NATIONS— RESOLUTION OF LIONS CLUB OF KEMMERER, WYO.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Lions Club, of Kemmerer, Wyo., favoring a world organization of nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we believe the people of the United States of America are overwhelmingly in favor of a world organization of nations, large and small, to stop aggression, preserve the peace, and promote social and economic harmony; and

Whereas we believe that it is the duty of all Americans, individually and collectively, to develop opinion and thinking on this tremendous subject and to make that opinion and thinking known in such unmistakable terms as to leave no doubt of this Nation's desire to prevent such useless carnage and

destruction as is now abroad in the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lions Club of Kemmerer, Wyo., United States of America, in regular meeting assembled, That:

1. Pending the development of details and the completion of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, or some other similar world organization, we believe the President of the United States, the State Department and the Senate should conclude, as soon as possible, agreements with our principal allies providing for complete present and future demilitarization of Germany and Japan;

2. The United States of America should use all reasonable means to assure our allies and the other nations of the world that we intend to share in the direction of and responsibility for the settlement of the war and the maintenance of peace thereafter, with force, if necessary.

3. We know that the founding fathers recognized the need for both unity and force when they converted a loose and disorganized group of colonies into our present Federal system of government. We know, also, from the history and development of that Federal Government that they were right in their convictions, despite the fact that the original document was neither perfect nor complete. We believe that the principle of unity for safety and other purposes can likewise be beneficially applied among nations. Drawing further from the history of our Constitution and the judgments of a free and unbiased court system which has breathed life therein and formulated policies of government thereunder to the end that the Constitution has grown and lived with the economic life and necessity of the people, we believe that the framework and the details of a world organization must be worked out by the chosen leaders of the nations; that the document on which it is based must be elastic enough to expand to meet the needs which the future will dictate; that the document must be given life, growth and policies through the judgments of a final tribunal or assembly; and, finally, that such judgments, when the necessity arises, must be carried out by force of arms contributed by the signatory nations.

We, therefore, endorse and urge a world organization such as is indicated in the broad, basic principles agreed on at Dumbarton Oaks, notwithstanding the fact that it is neither perfect nor complete.

Dated at Kemmerer, Wyo., April 17, 1945.

KEMMERER LIONS CLUB,
MERL CASE, President.

J. F. JACOLETT, Secretary.

Members: W. J. Withespoon, H. R. Christmas, Hugh D. Schooley, J. A. Christmas, Frank H. Taylor, A. G. Sant, R. O. Hummer, M. D. H. A. Lewis, D. S. Hunter, G. E. Sorensen, Harry Julian, Platt Wilson, R. M. Turner, F. L. Fagnant, L. M. Pratt, Don Urquhart, Kendall R. Peterson, Richard J. Millward, Joseph Canosa, A. L. Burgoon, Otto Angelo, Ralph Rosenberg, C. P. Spears, Roy Beachler, Wm. S. Edmonds, J. Orson Bohn, Earl Ellsworth, P. J. Quealy, G. S. Sawaya, F. E. Curtis, Cleo C. Wright, Roy A. Davidson, Guy G. Hill, Jas. McNamara, Carl B. Arentson, Wilford Williams, R. B. Johnson, C. D. Emery, Andy Morrow, V. J. Staudeher.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution is a full, true, and complete copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Lions Club, of Kemmerer, Wyo., United States of America, at a regular meeting held April 17, 1945, as the same now appears in the minutes of said club.

MERL CASE, President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

From the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 633. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such; without amendment (Rept. No. 225).

From the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 24. A bill for the relief of the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District; with an amendment (Rept. No. 226).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1561. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio; without amendment (Rept. No. 227).

By Mr. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Vonnie Jones, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 228);

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Frank Lore and Elizabeth Vidotto; without amendment (Rept. No. 229); and

H. R. 2129. A bill for the relief of Edward Lawrence Kunze; without amendment (Rept. No. 230).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 672. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Weir Lillis; with amendments (Rept. No. 233);

S. 784. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 234);

H. R. 244. A bill for the relief of Adell Brown and Alice Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 231);

H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Myles Perz; with an amendment (Rept. No. 235);

H. R. 1031. A bill for the relief of Matthew Mattas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 236); and

H. R. 2361. A bill for the relief of Alexander Sawyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 232).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 939. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of November 29, 1940 (Public Law 884, 76th Cong., 54 Stat. 1219), relating to promotion of Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps officers; with amendments (Rept. No. 237).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 233. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River; without amendment (Rept. No. 239);

S. 234. A bill authorizing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Yellowstone River near Fairview, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 240);

S. 454. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 243);

S. 527. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 241);

S. 574. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oregon", approved June 13, 1934; with an amendment (Rept. No. 244); and

H. R. 1659. A bill authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River; without amendment (Rept. No. 242).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECTS—REPORT OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 89) to provide for the planning of rural electrification projects, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 238) thereon.

Under the Senate rules the bill automatically goes to the calendar. As soon as the Senator from Nevada completes the bill which is now the unfinished business before the Senate, I serve notice that I shall move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 89.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill placed on the calendar.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, during the day the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] reported Senate bill 89, which deals with the Rural Electrification Administration. The bill has an amendment adopted by the committee creating the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency.

There has been some misunderstanding created by the press by the statement that this was a Republican-sponsored measure. I want to disabuse the mind of anybody who may entertain that impression, because the original report which was made by the subcommittee in a former session of the Congress was adopted unanimously by both Democratic and Republican members of the subcommittee.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] was not able to be present when the report was signed. The amendment as it first originated in the Senate was in the form of a bill sponsored by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself.

Mr. President, I ask that these remarks of mine be placed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] when he reported the bill referred to.

I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of April 30, 1945, dealing with this subject. In addition to that I ask to have printed in the RECORD the interim report made by the bipartisan committee of the Senate which conducted the hearings which brought forth the report.

Mr. President, I also have some telegrams referring to the bill of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], in addition to the ones I have asked to have printed in the RECORD. These telegrams come from various municipalities of the

State of Minnesota, and other public bodies dealing with the subject covered by the bill which has just been before the Senate, and which will be considered later. I ask that these telegrams be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INDEPENDENT R. E. A.

By a 13-to-6 vote the Senate Agricultural Committee approved a proposal to detach the Rural Electrification Administration from the Department of Agriculture where it was shifted in 1939 by Executive order. This move to restore R. E. A.'s independence should, in our opinion, be welcomed because the Department of Agriculture is as greatly in need of pruning, as the Department of Commerce was before the divorce of its R. F. C. lending agencies. We trust that efforts to reduce the Department of Agriculture to more manageable size will be pushed with a view to restoring also the independence of the Farm Credit Administration.

Owing to the need for conserving copper and steel for war use, and manpower shortages, the R. E. A. has been in eclipse for a number of years. But suspension of contemplated extensions of rural power systems financed with R. E. A. funds is only temporary. The future importance of that agency has been conspicuously brought to public notice in recent months by the bitter controversy provoked over the nomination of Aubrey Williams as head of R. E. A. The Senate's rejection of the nominee strongly indicates that Mr. Williams' opponents took for granted that the head of R. E. A. would be the responsible policy maker, notwithstanding his subordinate status. That assumption is itself a strong argument in favor of making the position independent in law as well as in fact.

The R. E. A. has already advanced more than half a billion dollars for the development of rural electrification, and indirectly its influence has been felt in the spur given to private developmental projects of similar character. Legislation now pending would greatly step up the war-curtailed operations of R. E. A. by providing for loan authorizations of approximately \$600,000,000 during the next 3 years, to finance farm power co-operatives. These electrification projects not only make life on the farm easier and pleasanter by means of labor-saving devices but they increase farm output. With millions of farm homes and many thousands of rural schools, churches, and industries still without electricity, the R. E. A. seems destined to play a very important part in helping to build up our post-war economy. That is another, perhaps the strongest, argument of all in favor of restoration of the agency's former independent status, provided, of course, that Congress retains sufficient control over the directing head to make sure he does not exceed his authority.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT—INTERIM REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE ON HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTION 197, PROVIDING FOR THE INQUIRY INTO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—JUNE 22, 1944

Your subcommittee, which was appointed to consider and report on the proposals made in Senate Resolution 197, to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Administration, has completed the preliminary phases of its inquiry and has elected to make this preliminary report.

The Rural Electrification Administration was originally created by an Executive order by the President, and later, by enactment of

law, was made a Federal agency under an administrator appointed by the President for a term of 10 years and confirmed by the Senate.

The provisions of law made the employees subject to civil service, and political activity by the Administrator and employees was prohibited by law. The Administrator was given full authority and responsibility only to the Congress. It was hoped at the time that the record of freedom from political activity and efficiency of management and operation of this agency would compare favorably with the record of T. V. A., which was also made an independent administrative agency not subjected to interference in its program and management.

So long as this policy of independence prevailed, the record of the R. E. A. was outstanding and fulfilled the highest expectations of the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States. All employees were directly responsible to the Administrator. The Administrator was responsible to the Congress.

Under the Reorganization Act of 1939, the R. E. A. was transferred to the Agricultural Department of the Federal Government. The order of transfer stated that the R. E. A. should be under the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. As a result, the various divisions of personnel were divorced from the R. E. A. organization and spread through the various personnel sections of the Department of Agriculture. The Administrator was deprived of authority to select his personnel. The legal department was transferred and became a part of the legal department of the Department of Agriculture. Centralization of authority and responsibility placed by the Congress in the person of the Administrator became dissipated among the various agencies of the Agricultural Department.

There is evidence that subordinates in the Department of Agriculture cooperated with subordinates in the R. E. A. and persons not employed by the Agricultural Department or the R. E. A., to undermine the authority placed by the Congress in the office and person of the Administrator.

The evidence also indicates that one source of disorganization and trouble was the almost constant effort of some of the employees and engineers of the R. E. A. to force upon the farm cooperatives a higher cost of conductors than was desired by some of the farm cooperatives. There was considerable evidence to indicate that the products of the Copperweld Steel Co. were favored over aluminum by some of the engineers having to do with the approval of contracts. The testimony in regard to this controversy was conflicting, but the committee is of the opinion that there was more than a legitimate and ethical connection between some of the engineers and other personnel employed by the R. E. A. in relation to the selection of conductors and other construction materials.

The testimony before the committee indicates that after the local co-ops had let contracts favoring aluminum as a lower cost conductor, pressure was brought to bear by employees of the R. E. A. to have the contracts canceled and new contracts made permitting the use of a higher cost conductor.

As these practices increased, more and more dissatisfaction, controversy, and intrigue became manifest as the testimony before the committee will show. This resulted in confusion, a lowering of morale of the personnel as authority and responsibility of the Administrator was usurped by various heads and personnel of the Agricultural Department.

There can be no doubt that the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, appointed by the President and confirmed in that appointment by the United States Senate, is no longer the Administrator of the R. E. A. in fact.

There can be no doubt that there is dissension among those in highest authority in the administration of R. E. A., that there is

divided authority, and therefore credence can be given to the reports which came to the committee of growing discord and distrust and disorganization within the R. E. A.

The Rural Electrification Administration was established by Congress as an agency responsible directly to the Congress. During the early years of the Administration, it was administered in accord with the spirit of the act and as an agency responsible to the Congress, or what is generally described as an independent agency. Throughout those years the Rural Electrification Administration gained the respect and the commendation of the Congress, as well as the people of the United States. It is fair to say that the Administration gained general approval and was singularly free from adverse criticism.

One of the most disrupting episodes causing further dissension and disorganization was the incorporation of certain private corporations for the operation of insurance companies and agencies to sell supplies and insurance to the R. E. A. cooperatives, their families, and others. The incorporators seem to have included some superintendents of local cooperatives.

Mr. Stoneman, now president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, testified he was one of them. An intensive campaign was started by the officers of this organization and various employees of the R. E. A. to induce the more than 800 local cooperatives to become members of this organization. In fact, the testimony indicates that before these corporations were formed, this scheme was originated by the Deputy Administrator, Mr. Robert B. Craig, who, under oath, testified that he was willing to accept the responsibility of parentage of this scheme.

There is some testimony in the record to indicate that the importance of such an organization for political purposes was estimated and appraised. But there is no testimony showing that the R. E. A. organization itself ever engaged in political activities.

This N. R. E. C. A. organization at first seemed to have the approval of the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator. However, after some time the true purpose of this organization became apparent.

It appears that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in order to start in the insurance business, had to have certain funds of the local cooperatives required by State law in various States where they intended to operate and conduct an insurance business. They proposed to obtain these funds by giving their notes to the cooperatives and so use the surplus funds of the cooperatives to start the insurance business.

When these facts came to the knowledge of the Administrator, Mr. Slattery, he wrote a letter of warning to the cooperatives, telling them to "stop, look, and listen." He also wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, to obtain a legal opinion as to the legality of the scheme permitting the local cooperatives to use their funds for such purpose, as of course their funds were under lien to the Government of the United States for loans.

That opinion of the Solicitor seems to have ended the scheme of this group, so far as selling insurance was concerned.

The action the Administrator, Mr. Slattery, took to obtain legal advice on this scheme to use the funds of the R. E. A. seems to have precipitated an attack upon the Administrator by officials of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, as well as by some officials of the Department of Agriculture. Up until that time the testimony shows, many letters by various members and officials of the National Rural Electric Cooperative had been exceedingly laudatory in their expressions of admiration for the ability and integrity of the Administrator of the R. E. A., Mr. Slattery.

It is interesting to note that when the Secretary of Agriculture was informed by the legal opinion of his Solicitor that moneys of the R. E. A. could not be used for such purposes as intended by the organizers of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, he warned employees of the R. E. A. to cease and desist from helping to further the scheme and joined Mr. Slattery in warning employees to have nothing to do with the N. R. E. C. A. There is evidence that thereafter certain Agriculture Department officials joined with the organizers of the N. R. E. C. A. in attempts to have Mr. Slattery removed as Administrator of the R. E. A. Pressure was brought upon the President to have him removed. This seems to have failed.

Mr. Slattery, having been appointed by the President, through the authority of a special act of Congress, for a period of 10 years, and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, the question of his removal without a hearing and without the filing of specific charges presented a legal problem that the President might hesitate to undertake, even had he so desired. Emissaries from the Department of Agriculture and of the N. R. E. C. A. brought pressure to bear upon the White House to get rid of the Administrator without resorting to removal for cause and upon hearing. There is direct evidence that he was offered another position subsequently to go to Europe to study rural electrification, at his present salary, if he would resign as Administrator of the R. E. A. This he refused to do.

We have a right to assume that the rumors and charges of incompetency and mismanagement on the part of Mr. Slattery, as Administrator, that were suddenly discovered, after he opposed the insurance activities of the N. R. E. C. A. to use the mortgage funds of the cooperatives to start their insurance companies, were carried to the President and made the basis for the request for his discharge or removal. Such action has our unqualified disapproval.

The rural electrification program has been regarded by the general public and the Congress and should continue to be regarded as a program to encourage the distribution of electric power to farmers at reasonable cost and to make possible the building of rural electrification distribution lines.

The authority given to the R. E. A. by Congress, and the only authority, was that of granting loans or credit to various groups or organizations which might be interested in the development and building of rural electrification distribution lines and the building of such electrical production plants as necessary where reasonable rates for electric power could be obtained, and the additional authority, of course, to protect and conserve the loans made by the Government to local cooperatives.

The disintegration and demoralization of personnel in the R. E. A. since its integration into the Department of Agriculture, is an outstanding contrast to the harmony and excellency of morale that appears to have existed prior thereto, and is an indictment of the administration under the Agricultural Department.

The T. V. A. was created as an independent agency and seems to have preserved the record of administration that has won the universal praise of the American people. It has apparently not been subjected to campaigns for exploitation by outside private individuals so far as is known. It has not been accused of political activities. It seems to have been operated as a business institution undertaking a service to the people that could not be furnished by private capital. Such an institution, it was hoped, the R. E. A. would be and continue to be of service to the farmers of the United States.

The testimony of John M. Carmody, who was Administrator of R. E. A. immediately prior to the reorganization of R. E. A., is very impressive and supports in every way the idea of strict independence of the R. E. A. Mr.

Carmody made an excellent Administrator, but despite his zealous devotion to the work of R. E. A. and his high esteem for the program of rural electrification, he retired from his position as Administrator of the R. E. A. immediately after the Reorganization Act became effective. There can be no question as to why he retired. He made his reasons known in the testimony before the committee. He feared that the success of the R. E. A. would be impaired, and the R. E. A. would be handicapped when it became subordinate to the Department of Agriculture. He anticipated the menace of "layers of authority" over R. E. A. His anticipations and fears were fully justified.

There can be no doubt of the desire and intention of Congress in enacting the legislation making the R. E. A. an independent institution and providing that the term of office of the Administrator should be for 10 years. The Congress desired to protect the administration of the R. E. A. program from all kinds of political influence, and desired to establish the R. E. A. as an agency of government entirely free and independent of any and every influence other than that of the act itself and the officials and employees appointed to administer the act.

As one witness before the committee emphasized, there is every reason and every obligation in a democratic form of government to divorce, in every way possible, the administration of any units of government engaged in the administration of economic affairs or business from the political affairs of the Government. Any other course of action is a step toward the totalitarian state.

Your subcommittee has elected, therefore, to make this preliminary report with recommendations relating to the emergency situation within R. E. A. The rural-electrification program has had such general and enthusiastic approval, and the evidence before your subcommittee raises questions about many matters of administration within R. E. A., and by grace of the influence of R. E. A. in the rural-electrification cooperatives which deserve and even demand further study.

However, the subcommittee has labored faithfully with the limited funds and time permitted, and while we are expecting information which has been requested and will be requested from the departments concerned, the record of testimony presented before the committee now justifies a recommendation that the Rural Electrification Administration be by law returned to its status first assigned to it by the Congress, and this committee recommends that that be done at the earliest possible date.

E. D. SMITH.
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.
G. M. GILLETTE.
GEORGE D. AIKEN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 2, 1945.

SENATOR HENRIK SHIPSTEAD:

Heartily in accord with Senate bill 2 providing for post-war airport program and calling for 50 percent grants to cities for C. A. A. approved airport projects with direct dealings between cities and C. A. A.

Mayor MARVIN L. KLINE.

APRIL 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

ROCHESTER, MINN., May 2, 1945.

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Rochester, Minn., favors Senate bill 2; we urge your support.

PAUL A. GRASSLE, Mayor.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 2, 1945.

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Passage of S. 2 Federal-aid airport bill, threatens Minnesota's forward-looking aviation program, in that it imposes conditions and restrictions that the legislature cannot meet as price for Federal aid. Note sections 9, 14, and 15.

S. 2 fails to recognize mutual aspect of Federal, State, municipal cooperation.

S. 2 replaces State authority and control for that of Federal.

S. 2 tends to deprive Metropolitan Airport Commission of Twin Cities of any control or regulation of its facilities if they should use Federal funds.

Representative VERNON S. WELCH,
Chairman, House Aviation.

ROCHESTER, MINN., May 2, 1945.

SENATOR HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Washington, D. C.:

Recommend passage Senate bill 2 providing for post-war airport program.

ROCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
ERWIN L. BRIESE,
Executive Secretary.

INVESTIGATION OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to report, with amendments, Senate Resolution 112, and I also ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask what the resolution is?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that this is merely a continuation of a resolution which was adopted on February 26, 1945, with the understanding at that time that the Senator from Florida, who was interested in the resolution, would attempt to make an investigation in his own State to determine whether or not the original resolution (S. Res. 35) would afford sufficient time.

The pending resolution grows out of the fact that an investigation of certain financing in the State of Florida, conducted by investigators of the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department was, according to the contention of the people of Florida, impairing the good faith and credit of their institutions. The Senator

from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, caused an investigation to be made, and the Senator from Florida, who was vitally interested, thought that further evidence should be taken in Florida and asked for a continuation of the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Am I right in my understanding that it proposes an investigation by the Securities and Exchange Commission?

Mr. LUCAS. No; by a Senate committee. The Committee on the Judiciary has been investigating certain investigations conducted there by the Securities and Exchange Commission as well as the Post Office Department, who have been investigating certain transactions in the State of Florida. The authorities of the State of Florida contending that such investigations are doing irreparable injury to the financial structure of certain institutions there.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution, submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on April 2, 1945.

The amendments of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate were on line 6 after the word "until", to strike out "January 1, 1946" and insert "December 31, 1945"; and in line 8, after the word "by", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to February 23, 1945 (relating to an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress until December 31, 1945; and that the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by \$2,500.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of April 1945, from the chairmen and acting chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).....	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.....	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	\$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (A. A.) U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.....	do.....	1,512

DAVID I. WALSH, Chairman.

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

APRIL 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve	5305 41st St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	\$2,400
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,400
Yeoman Second Class Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve	2134 R St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	1,152
Yeoman Second Class Loretto F. Joehman, U. S. Naval Reserve	do.	do.	1,152

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

MAY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

name of the person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle	612 Bennington Drive, Silver Spring, Md.	Veterans' Administration	\$5,000

JAMES M. TUNNELL, Chairman.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
LANDS AND SURVEYS,
APRIL 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April, in compliance with the terms of Senate

Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum):

Memorandum to Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

From: Senator PAT McCARRAN, chairman, subcommittee investigating the administration and use of public lands.

The following persons are detailed from the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, to

assist with the work of the above subcommittee:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF-12; basic salary \$5,000, per annum.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF-5; basic salary, \$2,000, per annum.

CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman.By W. H. McMAMINS,
Clerk.

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

APRIL 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.	\$2,000
Hope C. Heslep	2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Joan P. Karasik	1919 19th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,800
Charles Kramer	4621 South 34th St., Arlington, Va.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,500
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	3,800
Darel McConkey	Lanham, Md.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Mary Jane Oliveto	500 B St. NE., Washington, D. C.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	1,800
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	8,000
Marjorie J. Tillis	211 Delaware Ave. SW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,200

H. M. KILGORE, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

MAY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of

April 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, 3d and Independence Ave. SW.	\$3,200
Groff Conklin	514 2d St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	5,600
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,800
Richard P. Daniels	1743 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	1,440
Marion Dillon	3659 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,200
Ruth Fine	804 Houston Ave., Takoma Park, Md.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,000
Rose Gerber	2513 14th St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	2,000
Harald Lund	476 N St. SW., Washington, D. C.	do.	6,200
Joseph McMurray	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, 14th and Constitution Ave. NW.	4,600
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.	5,600
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.	2,000
Ruth Morgenstein	3022 Rodman St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,600
Sari Schwartz	1701 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,000
Lt. Leslie Falk, Army of the United States, Medical Corps	2804 Terrace Rd. SE., Washington, D. C.	U. S. Army, Pentagon Bldg.	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, U. S. Naval Reserve	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.	U. S. Navy, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,000

CLAUDE FEPPER, Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
May 1, 1945.

Mr. LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. BIFFLE: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 55, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business

who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

By DEWEY ANDERSON,
Executive Secretary.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

MAY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
F. O. Billings	Dodge Hotel, Washington, D. C.	Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oreg.	\$3,800
Brainard Cheney	3418 Highwood Drive SE., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Agnes E. Crivella	1408 Buchanan St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,700
Emerald G. Devitt	2425 27th St. South, Arlington, Va.	do.	2,100
Elsie A. Digges	120 C St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	1,800
Herman Edelsberg	2141 Suitland Terrace SE., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Harry J. Evans	3010 Gainesville St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	6,500
F. Preston Forbes	502 Four Mile Road, Alexandria, Va.	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.	4,000
Carol M. Fuller	2101 S St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,100
Scott K. Gray, Jr.	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	4,000
Stella J. Groep	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Kathleen Kimball	1701 Park Road NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,000
Elizabeth P. Lucas	1730 North Quincy St., Arlington, Va.	do.	1,800
John W. Nelson	The Delano Apartments, Washington, D. C.	do.	5,600
Vernice M. O'Mullane	Alcott Hall, Washington, D. C.	do.	1,680
Jack H. Pollack	4307 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	4,000
Grace F. Purdy	280 Rhode Island Ave. NE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,300
Martha G. Ray	1457 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,100
Lt. George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,400
L. Evelyn Spicer	1708 Kilbourne Place NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Frederick W. Steckman	4900 Cathedral Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	5,000
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	1,800
Allen G. Thurman	210 East Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Alfred J. Van Tassel	1622 Mount Eagle Place, Alexandria, Va.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Olga Yelencsics	2400 13th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,100

The above number of employees gave approximately 12 hours of their time during this month in a consultant capacity: War Production Board (5); National Housing Agency (1); Federal Works Agency (1); Agriculture (1).

JAMES E. MURRAY, Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 940. A bill to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 941. A bill to enlarge the jurisdiction of the United States district courts in suits against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WHEELER):

S. 942. A bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 943. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at Northport, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce;

S. 944. A bill for the relief of Albert J. Walch; and

S. 945. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Sisk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 946. A bill to amend the joint resolution of July 29, 1941, relating to the removal of officers from the active list of the Regular Army; and

S. 947. A bill to provide for hospitalization and treatment of accredited war correspondents in Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 948. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941 (Public Law 163, 77th Cong., 55 Stat. 583), relating to prostitution near military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 949. A bill relating to unused leave accumulated prior to retirement by officers placed on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 950. A bill for the relief of Albert R. Ost; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 951. A bill to provide for a method of liquidation and sale of homes in Farm Security Project No. RRM021; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 952, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 953. A bill granting to the State of Illinois all right, title, and interest of the United States of America, in and to the land comprising the right-of-way of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, as the same was routed and constructed through the public lands of the United States in the State of Illinois, and in and to the 90 feet of land on each side of said canal for the entire length thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 954. A bill granting a pension to George Gillibrand; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 955. A bill for the relief of Ada B. Foss; and

S. 956. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen E. Sanders; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado) introduced Senate bill 957, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCLELLAN introduced Senate bill 958, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 959. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 960. A bill to facilitate employment of necessary personnel in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. YOUNG) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 61, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. MEAD):

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1942

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the payment of family allowances under the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, to the dependents of enlisted men imprisoned pursuant to court martial proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 952) relating to the payment of family allowances under the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, to the dependents of enlisted men imprisoned pursuant to court martial proceedings, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that this bill is introduced for the reason that once in a while some poor private is arrested and court martialed. In one instance of which I know, a young man was sent to the penitentiary for 30 years. Within 6 months the allowance to his wife and small child stopped. The bill is designed to prevent that sort of thing.

MEDALS TO WAR CORRESPONDENTS WHO PERFORM EXCEPTIONALLY MERITORIOUS SERVICES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the other day a group of distinguished Senators introduced a bill to award posthumously to Ernie Pyle, the Congressional Medal of Honor. That bill was held up in the Senate Military Affairs Committee, due to the fact that Congressional Medals of Honor are specifically limited to men in the armed services who have performed heroically. So, today, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will create a new medal to be known as the Distinguished Service News Medal, which may be awarded by the President to newsmen, photographers, commentators, or radiomen who perform meritoriously in the war.

I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 957). A bill to provide for the issuance of medals to war correspondents who perform exceptionally meritorious services; was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the Distinguished Service News Medal, which shall have distinctive devices and appurtenances, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to accredited representatives of press and radio who have rendered or who hereafter render exceptionally meritorious service in the performance of their duties outside the continental limits of the United States in time of war.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN AND MEN

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, on behalf of various Senators and myself, a joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment providing that the rights of women and men shall be co-equal.

I feel strongly that the adoption of this amendment would be a forward step and a wise one. Its adoption would certainly be one of the most important stages in the development of opportunities for women. Of course, I realize that for many years in countless indispensable ways women have had many varied fields of usefulness which they have utilized for the benefit of humanity.

However, ever-changing economic factors and processes have made constantly more urgent the demand that women be given the right to exercise certain other privileges which have so far in a measure been denied them. It may be that economic conditions of other days did not make imperative that such rights and privileges exist in a full sense. Nevertheless for many years women have given unmistakable and entirely convincing evidence that they are entitled to equality of opportunity with men and that society in the broad sense of the term would be greatly benefited by the exercise of women of such rights.

The wholesome trend toward such a realization has received a tremendous impetus because of and during the progress of the present World War. The tragic intensity and all-comprehensiveness of our war program have found women not only willing but also ready and competent to do a large part in the fight for freedom and democracy. Their contribution on the home front and on the battlefield during the present war has been outstanding and indispensable.

We are reminded that equality of opportunity will call also for equality of responsibility. Certainly so, but both terms in application are relative as to persons concerned, whether men or women. As individuals, whichever our sex, we can avail ourselves of our opportunities and also meet our responsibilities only as our physical fitness, special talents, other facilities, and circumstances will permit.

Some people fear that by the adoption of this amendment women may be deprived of certain necessary protective legislation now existing which was enacted for their special benefit and was so designated. Certainly we should be sufficiently resourceful to guard against injurious results occurring, bearing in mind the fact that opportunity and responsibility should be considered really from the standpoint of each individual and not from the standpoint of sex. I feel confident that with the adoption of an equal rights amendment the availability of individuals, whether they are men or women, to exercise specific duties, or to sustain successfully demands of responsibility, can be regulated with increasing success. We will continue to seek that goal at which no one, man or woman, will be forced to attempt to do that for which there is neither mental qualification nor physical fitness.

It is obvious that the adoption of an equal-rights amendment may require changes in certain existing remedial legislation. Surely adequate legislation designed to suit individual needs and limitations can be framed and passed. A period of moratorium is provided in this proposed amendment during which the most obvious requirements for enactment of legislation can be satisfied. Further legislation can and doubtless will be passed from time to time as conditions seem to warrant and to require.

I hope and believe that an amendment creating equal rights for men and women will become the law of the land.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relative to equal rights for men and women, introduced by Mr. RADCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULLERIGHT, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. YOUNG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, several years ago I announced my support of the equal-rights amendment and I am still heartily in favor of it.

Further, since both parties favor it by unanimous vote in their party platforms, I can see no possible reason for delay.

A number of our allies have already granted equality under the law to women, (China, Russia, San Salvador among them).

Why should the United States, now winning the war through the aid of millions of women, withhold this justice any longer?

There may be excuses for not passing this amendment but there are no valid reasons. I beg the Senate to act quickly.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, lest there be any misunderstanding insofar as the proposed equal-rights amendment is concerned, I wish the Senate to know that there are just as many Republican sponsors of the proposed amendment as there are Democratic sponsors of it. I wish to make it perfectly plain that in the Committee on the Judiciary, at the time when the measure was being considered by it, the Republican members of the committee were just as anxious to have it reported favorably as were the Democratic Members. I venture the prophesy that when the measure comes to a vote on the floor of the Senate, there will be just as many Republican votes for it, proportionately, as there will be Democratic votes. Personally, I wish to say at this time that I intend to give it my wholehearted, enthusiastic, and unqualified support.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. This amendment is offered for the purpose of providing a hospital for tuberculosis patients among the Indians of Montana who are victims of that disease. I have prepared a statement in connection with

the amendment which I ask to have printed in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana will be received and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MURRAY to House bill 3024, is as follows:

On page 40, after line 21, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For construction, including equipment, of a 150-bed tuberculosis hospital for Indians in the State of Montana, \$600,000, to be available immediately."

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY in connection with the amendment is as follows:

Mr. President, I am offering this amendment to H. R. 3024, the Interior Department appropriation bill, asking for an appropriation of \$600,000 with which to erect a tuberculosis hospital for the benefit of the many Indians of Montana who are victims of that disease. I have been in conference with Dr. H. De Lien, Director of Health of the Office of Indian Affairs, who has advised me that the Construction Division of the Indian Office has placed an estimated cost of \$4,000 per room or an estimated total cost of \$600,000 for the construction of a 150-bed hospital.

The death rate of Indians suffering from tuberculosis in Montana is alarming. Totally inadequate facilities are available for treating the victims of this disease. These unfortunate people are being cared for in camps and private dwellings. The Montana State Hospital at Galen, Mont., itself is inadequate to take care of white patients seeking admittance for medical attention.

Prior to the war, the Indian Office had planned for a tuberculosis hospital, but these plans were laid aside because of the emergency. The Indian Office now strongly recommends that an appropriation be made and that the construction of the institution be commenced without unnecessary delay.

The extremely high death rate among Indians from tuberculosis is a problem that should be of deep concern to the Congress. The only available institutions for housing these Indians are at the Tacoma Indian Hospital, Fort Lapwai Sanatorium, and the Sioux Sanatorium. The facilities of those institutions are greatly overtaxed.

I need not call your attention to the magnificent service the American Indians are giving to this country in this war. Indian heroes are being reported almost daily from every field of warfare. These soldiers have freely offered their lives for the preservation of this country. It is only fitting and proper that this Government show its appreciation by providing the necessary hospitalization for the victims of tuberculosis among our Indian citizens.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES TO NONCOMBATANT AREAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that any demobilization of the armed forces which may occur subsequent to the termination of organized hostilities between the United States and Germany should be so conducted, to the extent practicable and to the extent consistent with the vigorous and successful prosecution of the war between the United States and Japan, as to provide for the release, from the several services and branches of the service, on the basis of the

first-in-first-out rule, of those members of such forces desiring release therefrom.

SEC. 2. It is further declared to be the sense of the Congress that, to the extent practicable and to the extent consistent with the vigorous and successful prosecution of the war between the United States and Japan, assignments of members and units of the armed forces having had prolonged or heavy combat duty should be made in such a manner as to provide for their assignment to duty in noncombat areas for a reasonable period.

INVESTIGATION OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the President of the United States and all of us in Congress, as well as the people of America, are very much interested in the situation which prevails in the Philippine Islands, which have been the scene of war for several years. Devastation has been considerable. Trade has been demoralized. Priorities are difficult to obtain, as well as shipping.

Recently the President asked the present speaker to come to the White House to discuss this matter with him, and stated that he would like the Senator from Maryland to go to the Philippines and try to gather some of the important information so that Congress might take appropriate action. In pursuance of that conversation and at the wish of the President, I have decided to make the trip as soon as I can conveniently do so. I have taken the matter up with the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, which will have to pass on any resolution dealing with the proposed trip. The committee on Territories and Insular Affairs is very anxious to gain information respecting the islands, and I ask unanimous consent to submit a brief resolution which I ask to have read at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to visit the Philippine Islands, during the present Congress, for the purpose of making an investigation and study of economic and other conditions in such Islands; and, in particular, war damages and compensation therefor and the effect of the war upon the industrial and agricultural enterprises in said Islands, and the post-war economy thereof, and also to survey the territorial and administrative problems incident to any other islands in the Pacific which may come under the jurisdiction of the United States. The committee shall make such reports and recommendations to the Senate concerning any such study and investigation as it deems appropriate and desirable. The expenses incurred under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,000, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the resolution is referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the chairman of that committee will try to get the committee members together, and report the resolution favorably, and designate a small subcommittee of Senators to make the trip. The reason I bring the matter to the attention of the Senate now is that I think it is of prime

importance, and if any Senator has any suggestions he may wish to contribute respecting what the committee might appropriately do to make our mission a success we shall be very grateful to receive them. We anticipate going to the Philippines in the not far distant future, and probably will be absent from the Senate Chamber for 3 weeks or so.

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was received and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

ALLIE J. HACKNEY

Mr. BILBO submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 124) which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Allie J. Hackney, widow of James E. Hackney, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. MURAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a prepared statement in explanation of the amendment submitted by myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] on April 3, 1945 to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

This amendment is proposed in order to remove any doubt that so-called subsidies in connection with price roll-backs are matters of right rather than executive discretion in individual cases. It is drawn so that administrative agencies may not achieve an arbitrary result under the guise of setting off disputed claims or as an arbitrary penalty for some fanciful violation of any one of the countless regulations relating to production, price, or distribution. Where an administrative agency makes such a set-off or withholds subsidies as a penalty, it has the effect of arbitrarily putting small concerns out of business without a day in court. In short, the subsidy system must not be allowed to operate as a device for subjecting small businesses to arbitrary action, where they are demonstrably and admittedly entitled to receive the subsidy.

This amendment does not compel the payment of subsidies where the party does not qualify for current payments, because it applies only to any currently eligible person. It therefore leaves it to the subsidy administrators to determine the present eligibility of any person; but it does prevent an administrator from saying, "You are now eligible but I will not pay you your subsidies." Let me say again, if the party is not eligible for a subsidy, he is not entitled to it under this provision; but, if he is admittedly eligible, then it may not be denied him upon some other arbitrary ground.

An example of this situation arises when some administrative agency has certified a business as eligible for a subsidy, the business has operated upon such certification and

could not otherwise operate without incurring ruinous losses, the subsidies so received are passed on to either producers or consumers through the roll-back system, and then the administrative agency thinks it made a mistake in originally paying the subsidy and demands repayment. To enforce such repayment, the agency refuses to pay any further subsidies (by withholding them arbitrarily and applying them on the amount claimed), even though there is no question as to the present eligibility of the business. The effect is simply to force the business to close its doors, no matter how badly its facilities are needed or how unjust the withholding. If it had not been certified as eligible, it would not have done the business in the first place, because it could not make ends meet under the roll-back system without the subsidy. It has not been unjustly enriched, because it has passed on the subsidy to the producer or consumer. It is asked to assume a debt—I have been told of one demand amounting to nearly half a million dollars—which its finances will not stand and which no other operator in the same business assumes. Nevertheless, it is asked to assume this debt as the price of continuing to do business or—as often happens—it necessarily goes out of business.

Large businesses may pay the sums so demanded because they have the money and they can sue at their leisure in the Court of Claims. Small businesses haven't the money to pay. If they sought injunctions against the withholding, it would take time—and meanwhile the business is at a standstill. If they secured an injunction, still the Government could take an appeal and in all likelihood secure a stay against the payment of public moneys until final judgment is had after all appeals are exhausted. Meanwhile the small businessman is out of business, he is losing his employees, his overhead may be running on, and he is asked to undertake the financial and other burdens of litigation requiring specialists and proceedings in courts in the District of Columbia far from his home.

I have thus far been speaking of the equities and practicalities of the situation. This amendment seeks to bring administrative practice into conformity with justice and present law. The Supreme Court has held that, in making a similar payment provided by law, "the Government had a real obligation" (*Texas & Pacific Ry. Co. v. United States* (286 U. S. 285, 289)). "These payments were not subsidies or bonuses" (*Continental Tie & L. Co. v. United States* (286 U. S. 290, 294)). Even in pension cases the claimant may resort to the courts "in the absence of compelling language" of statute and "the power of the administrative officer will not, in the absence of a plain command, be deemed to extend to the denial of a right which the statute creates, and to which the claimant, upon facts found or admitted by the administrative officer, is entitled" (*Dis-muke v. United States* (297 U. S. 167, 172)).

As a matter of fact, in these subsidy cases the withholding is applied to all subsidies and not merely to the one in issue. But that is clearly illegal. The Attorney General has held that "the head of the department has no right to set off one independent claim against another" (9 Op. Atty. Gen. 401, 402). In the same volume the Attorney General has set forth the situation at the following length:

"When a claim is presented which is undeniably legal and just, can the Secretary admit the title of the claimant and set up a counter claim on the part of the Government as a reason for not paying it? That is the question here, and I confess I do not see how it is to be answered in the affirmative.

"There is no act of Congress giving any such power to the Secretary of the Treasury. At common law even the judiciary have not the authority to set off one demand against an-

other. It is conferred by statute, wherever it exists, both in England and America; and every defalcation act prescribes cautious limitations to its exercise. Can it be that an executive officer is clothed, by virtue of his office, with a judicial power which the general principles of the law have refused to the courts; and which no legislature has suffered even a court to assume without imposing careful restrictions upon it? * * *

"Here is a claim fiercely contested. It has never been adjudicated in favor of the Government. * * * Every fact asserted by one party is not only open to contradiction by the other, but is in fact contradicted, and I have no doubt is most potentially believed to be untrue. Not only are all the facts vehemently disputed, but the parties are as wide asunder as the poles on every question of law. It is proposed that this complicated entanglement shall be settled in the chamber of an executive officer, without a trial, without judge or jury, without examining witnesses, and without hearing counsel.

"No such jurisdiction is given to the Secretary of the Treasury by any law, and if the Constitution is not a dead letter Congress cannot confer it. * * * If an executive officer can make an order that the widow and children of Reside shall be deprived of \$24,000 without a trial, then the same officer may, with equal propriety, issue a warrant to hang them, since the Constitution puts life and property on the same footing. * * *

"The Secretary of the Treasury has no power to stop the payment of the money adjudged to Mrs. Reside, however well he may be satisfied in his own mind that the counter claim is well founded. If he is convinced of the indebtedness alleged, he should order a suit to be brought, and give the party a fair chance to be heard before the regular tribunals of the country. I am not aware that such a power was ever claimed before it was used by the late secretary in this case; but if it be a practice of the Department it ought to be immediately abolished, for it is unjust, unlawful, and unconstitutional." (9 Op. Atty. Gen. 197, 199-200, 201.)

The courts have had infrequent occasion to consider this question presumably because executive officers have not assumed the arbitrary power of set-off and because, in the usual case, suit in the Court of Claims is an adequate remedy, whereas in the case of a small business such a suit—if available—is not adequate because of the time element. Before the matter could be litigated to final judgment it would have lost the opportunity to do business for a year or more. Where such arbitrary set-off has been attempted, the courts have held as follows:

"While Congress may limit the benefits to the veteran * * * to the discretion of the Administrator, the language of the statute does not give him the power to enter judgments against the veteran [by determining a set-off because of alleged prior overpayment] in an ex parte proceeding, without notice and hearing. The mere fact that the overpayment makes conclusive the discretion of the Administrator in granting the benefit does not carry with it a conclusiveness in discretion in taking it away retroactively. As we read the statute Congress never attempted to vest in the Administrator a right to enter a judgment or to deprive a veteran of property without due process of law" (*Hines v. United States*) (105 F. 2d 85, 70 App. D. C. 206, 210), per Vinson, judge).

In the leading case of *Richmond, F. & P. R. Co. v. McCull* (69 F. 2d 203, 207 (App. D. C.), certiorari denied, 288 U. S. 615), the Interstate Commerce Commission assumed to set off certain moneys claimed from others admittedly due for carrying mail and the court (in affirming a decree granting an injunction) said that the administrative agency "is without the power of a court to enter a judgment. The legal effect of the order therefore is no more than a bookkeeping ascertainment

* * * of an indebtedness * * * To give it finality, it was necessary it should be reduced to judgment. * * * The services appellant rendered * * * are admitted. The amount due therefor is not contested, and so we have a case in which the United States owe appellant money which the Comptroller General refuses to pay because of an unsettled and unliquidated claim of the United States against appellant. This may not be done."

If this were not the rule, parties subject to regulation by several agencies or in several respects would never succeed in settling any account so long as some administrative officer asserted a claim.

I hope the committee will favor this amendment, because it affords protection to those who need it. We speak these days a great deal about human rights all over the world. That includes the United States and its people. That includes the small businessman. That includes the American citizen. On the other hand, the Government is deprived of nothing that it merits, because it may sue for moneys it claims, or it may set off its claims in any suit brought by private parties, or it may secure injunctions or indictments against black market operators. This amendment would not protect any black market operator, for he doesn't need a subsidy and will not submit to the inspection required to receive one. Even if a black market operator were involved in a subsidy case, the course for the Government to take is to put him out of business or in jail, rather than to allow him to continue business by paying to the Treasury some of his ill-gotten gains at the expense of consumers. A black-market operator has money to assume arbitrary charges imposed by administrative agencies, but a small legitimate operator does not.

Every consideration of law, fair dealing, and sound government is met and fostered by this amendment. I again request the committee to favor it.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I hereby report that, as chairman of the Commerce Committee, I have designated the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to act in my place, and I have appointed the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] vice the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, in accordance with law; and request that they be granted leave of absence for May 4 and 5, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave of absence as requested by the Senator from North Carolina for the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] is granted.

IN DEFENSE OF POLITICIANS—ARTICLE BY CLAUDE G. BOWERS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, in the spring issue of the Virginia Quarterly Review there is an article contributed by Hon. Claude G. Bowers, the American Ambassador to the Chilean Government, entitled "In Defense of Politicians." This is a good article, and, in view of the criticism that is being so often leveled at us here, especially by the late Mr. Hitler, the late Mr. Mussolini, and Franco, I am glad to see some man with a knowledge of history write an article such as that written by Mr. Bowers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF POLITICIANS

(By Claude G. Bowers)

Recently I took up for a rereading that charming and illuminating work, *The Endless Adventure*, the monumental masterpiece of the brilliant Scotch historian and philosopher, Frederick Oliver, dealing with the Walpolean period of English history, and I was startled by something I had missed before—his pages devoted to praise of politicians. No doubt my attention was attracted on the second reading because in recent years the tendency in America to sneer at political parties and politicians has seemed to have gained momentum in the popular mind. That, and the fact that in recent years I have been in the storm centers of the attacks on democracy by the Fascist, Nazi, and Falangist forces that set out a few years ago to erect the most autocratic and tyrannical totalitarian governments on the ruins of democratic institutions. I have observed, close hand, that invariably the preliminary campaign has taken the form of a denunciation of political parties and corrupt politicians. The assumption of the Goebbels propagandists is that a political party not dominated by the state is a "faction," and that all politicians are incompetent and corrupt. The effect intended is to destroy the faith of the people in party government and in their political leaders. In view of their records as corruptionists, pillagers of private property, and armed thieves, it ought to be amusing to find men like Hitler and Goering piously denouncing politicians as corrupt. But one only need read the newspapers and books and see the plays, musical comedies, and jugglers of the vaudeville stage in America to reach the conclusion that this Fascist line of attack on democratic institutions has become quite commonplace here. The effect, if not the purpose, and in most cases I do not think it is the conscious purpose, is to weaken the faith of the American people in the institutions of the founding fathers. For common sense must make it clear that in a nation of 130,000,000 people reaching from coast to coast over thousands of miles of mountain and valley, democracy could not function in orderly fashion without political organizations holding concrete views of national policy to be pressed upon the people through the constitutional instrumentality of the polls.

There certainly are some corrupt politicians, just as there are corrupt financiers, corrupt merchants, corrupt industrialists, and corrupt preachers, but no one is so unfair as to draw a sweeping indictment against these sectors of society because they contain, here and there, a corrupt man. Only in the case of politicians is the charge made general. And that, of course, is a fantastic falsehood. When we reflect that in the case of men engaged politically in the public service the spotlight is constantly thrown upon them and the microscope used in eager search of evidence of wrongdoing, we tremble to think what might be the result if all the other elements of society were subjected to the same constant and intensive scrutiny.

And nothing could be more amusing than the notion that with the elimination of politicians, which would mean the extermination of democracy, corruption would disappear from government. It is common knowledge that the leaders of fascism in Italy and Germany have accumulated vast fortunes through the ungentle art of stealing by force; and in the stealing of the property of the citizens, these nabobs of tyranny also deprive them of their natural rights, their liberties, and their human dignity. This, astounding pillaging of the state and of individuals, by the totalitarian dignitaries, would be quite impossible where the people

can pass on such crimes through legal and political action.

A few weeks ago an American politician who had resorted to corruption to enrich himself died in miserable isolation and in poverty, despised by his countrymen, after serving a term in prison; but under a Fascist or Nazi regime, the corruptionists are the untouchables and there is no limit to the wealth they can accumulate through robbery by force. Yet these are the men, the Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Goerings, who have thundered so righteously against representative democratic government because of the "corrupt politicians."

There are politicians and politicians, just as there are bankers and embezzlers, and some of the politicians will graft just as some bankers have filched from the depositor. The greater part of the grafting comes from men far down in the scale of politicians, and it was not these petty politicians that the Hitlers and Mussolinis were trying to destroy, but the real leaders of popular government, the men who fought and wrought intelligently for democratic principles. They were the dangerous ones, because they led the people; and therefore the first step in all Fascist movements is to destroy the people's faith in their honest political leaders and to liquidate them.

Now the theoretical critic, having in mind the political leaders who have led mankind onward and upward in the democratic way to liberty and opportunity, are prone to describe them as statesmen, not politicians; and yet almost all of the greatest British and American statesmen have been consummate politicians, and have reached the place where they could serve mankind through political methods. Oliver reminds us that Adam Smith, who was a high-minded theorist, an economist, and a man of the closet, refused to discriminate between the politician and the statesman and lumped them together as corrupt. He denounced them as "that insidious and crafty animal vulgarly called a statesman or politician." And that, of course, was stupid in Adam Smith. For without statesmen, there would be no one skilled and trained in the art of government; and without these, society would revert to chaos.

Yet it has become a cheap fashion in America to parrot this propaganda of the Fascist-minded. The villain in the romance is apt to be a politician, and the guilty in the detective story in which a politician is one of the suspects is almost certain to be. The comedian in the musical comedy can always get the loud laugh that speaks the vacant mind by a fling at these politicians. Even the more precious element in the academy shrugs its shoulders and exclaims, "Ah, the politicians."

II

Let us call the roll of the greatest of Americans to whom we are indebted for our democratic liberties and institutions, guaranteed by law, for the protection of the citizen against the abuse of power. Who and what were they? They were these very much-maligned politicians.

The most consummate of them all, perhaps the most consummate in modern history, was Thomas Jefferson. It was he more than any other man who formulated the way of life known as the American way. He was a businessman, in that he was a successful planter until public service deprived him of his supervision, but as such he could have done nothing toward placing the imprint of his philosophy on our life. He was a philosopher, but there have been other philosophers with a philosophy making for the good of society, who did not know how to reach the public and put their philosophy into effect. Because he was a practical man, Jefferson did not take refuge in his closet and whine his criticisms of the men in public life. He sallied forth into the political arena with his battle-ax and became a politician. He knew that a philosophy

tucked away among the cobwebs in the closet will remain a curiosity and never become a reality. And being a politician, he was a realist.

As a politician he was a propagandist with few peers; a practical organizer unsurpassed; a diplomat with an intuitive knowledge of human nature, making it easy to work with and direct the activities of others. Thus during the first 12 years of the Republic he made it definitely a democracy; and through political inspiration and direction from afar, he and they who thought with him, also politicians, forced into the fundamental law the Bill of Rights. Had he not been a skilled and practical politician working for the welfare, the rights, and liberties of the people, our national destiny might have been vastly different from what it became.

There are two majestic memorials on the Mall in Washington to express the appreciation of a Nation for services to country and humanity—and one is to Jefferson, the politician.

The other is to another politician—Lincoln. After Jefferson, it would be hard to find another American so consummate as a politician. He has been so disguised by sentimentalists that few appear to know that in the Illinois of his day where politicians who knew all the answers flourished like the green bay tree, he was the most cunning and skillful of them all. I know of no biography that so perfectly reflects the man and his methods as that of Beveridge, who, being a politician himself, could sense and see the art with which Lincoln advanced to power. He, too, understood the politician's art of propaganda, the politician's science of organization, and he knew how, when necessary, to work under cover and get results. I am sure it is because Beveridge's book so clearly reveals his hero as primarily a politician, that the sentimentalists frown upon it. History credits him with the emancipation of the slaves and the preservation of the Union; but never could he have attained the power to render these incalculable services had he not been a clever politician; and even in power, his wisdom, superior to that of others, is manifest in his political methods.

Because of their success as politicians they were hated by their opponents in their day, but there are no national memorials to their critics on the Mall.

To Jefferson and Lincoln we may add Andrew Jackson, who rendered immeasurable service to the people in defeating the machinations of an embryo plutocracy through his genius as a great politician. His greatest battles were fought in the arena of politics, and there he was a master, clever, resourceful, militant, and even ruthless.

To sum up, all the great idols of the British-speaking peoples who have left indelible impressions on the two nations through the policies they sponsored and furthered have been professional politicians—men trained in politics, and that means in statecraft. From Walpole, in England, down through Pitt, Fox, Burke, Palmerston, Gladstone, Disraeli, and now Churchill, and in America from Jefferson and Sam Adams down through Monroe, Jackson, Lincoln, Johnson, Theodore Roosevelt, and now Franklin Roosevelt, the outstanding servants of the public good have been politicians.

At once someone will note the absence of Woodrow Wilson. His position is unique. A colossal figure, he will grow greater with the years. He was that rarest of all things—a statesman who had never been an active, experienced politician, and that makes him unique. But this calls for reservations. From his youth on, his mind was occupied most with the politics of statesmanship. His studies were in this sphere. But it was not until the eve of his elevation to the Presidency that he ever participated in political activities. Until then he had never made even a political speech; or faced the populace on the

hustings; or sat in caucus in devising ways and means of political action. He had an incurable distrust of men who had actually worked in politics, born of the cloistered life of the academy, and he thus deprived himself at a critical juncture of the advice of men grown old and wise in political struggles. I have never doubted that with all his genius as a statesman, and his advantage as an idealist, he might have succeeded in defeating the maneuvering of his enemies had he been trained more in the school of practical politics.

III

What is politics? Webster's definition says it is "the science and art of government", the science dealing with organization, regulation, and administration of a state . . . the theory or practice of managing or directing the affairs of public policy or of political parties."

Then what is a politician? The same authority says he is "one versed or experienced in the science of government."

There surely is nothing particularly disreputable about that, though Adam Smith might think so. But the short-sighted scoffers and the Fascist-minded insist that a politician is a mere seeker after office for the sake of the salary. It is true, of course, that among the thousands holding minor offices, many if not most, are motivated partly by the salary. Incidentally, droll as it may seem, it is the salary that draws men into counting rooms and banks and factories. However, if the man who gets the office earns his salary by performing his duties satisfactorily, he is discharging a necessary function in organized society. But in the higher ranks I know scores of men personally who enter politics, become politicians, and take office at a financial sacrifice because they are primarily interested in principles and policies they think for the good of the country; and among these are many who have sacrificed not only money, but also health and strength, in the service of the state—and all were politicians.

Possibly conceding all this, the critic falls back on the politicians of the lower ranks, the precinct committeemen, often dubbed "ward heelers." I am unable to find any thing disreputable in serving a party organization in this lowly position—since it is necessary. The statesman who began at the bottom in the organization may be all the better for it. The businessman makes a point of insisting that his men shall learn the business from the bottom up. Only in politics are the good men expected to begin at the top. These generally soon reach the bottom, since they have no real foundation of knowledge.

IV

This brings us to the pet anathema of the theorist and the Fascist-minded—the political parties. Mussolini would have none of them—none but his own, Hitler would have none of them—none but his own, Franco would have none of them—none but his own. None of these could afford a party of opposition. It would interfere with the destruction of human rights, with the suppression of liberty, and might make the liquidation of political opponents through bullet and bludgeon, and the stealing of the hierarchy, dangerous. It is significant of the wise thinking of the English that whatever party may be in power, the opposing party in minority officially is called His Majesty's Opposition. And it is recognized that His Majesty's Opposition performs a high function in the state. It exposes blunders, demands explanations, keep those in power on their mettle, and illuminates the political scene for the benefit of the public which has a right to know what is transpiring, since government is their business.

Sad experience has shown that stockholders in a corporation would often have been safer if there had been a party of opposition on the board of directors.

Without parties in a democracy there would be chaos; with but one party maintained by force, there is fascism and tyranny.

Political parties, then, are necessary, but if there are to be parties there must be party leaders, and if there are party leaders, there must be politicians. If these party leaders are worth their salt, they must be trained and experienced politicians. Oliver, philosopher, not politician, but wise with the wisdom of the historian, says that "the notion that we can save ourselves without their help is an illusion; for politics is not one of those crafts that can be learned by the light of nature without an apprenticeship."

A democracy must fail without leaders of courage, intelligence, and character. The assumption of Jefferson and Lincoln was that the mass mind can be trusted, or its instinct trusted, if provided with the facts; and but for political parties contending for the mastery, and engaging in polemics, the cause of liberty and human rights would perish because there would be no great organization concerning itself with the dissemination of the facts. Aguirre Cerda, a great Chilean president and statesman, framed an imperishable sentence when he said that "to educate is to govern." And he meant not only education in the schools, but education from the political hustings. That is the reason that the totalitarian cannot tolerate parties, for parties mean the open submission of facts and policies to the arbitrament of debate. The dictator must suppress political parties because he must impose silence. With but one party, and that an organ of the government, the rulers can keep the people in ignorance of the fact that their pockets are being picked and their liberties are being taken away.

If there is any better way to govern in a democracy than through the instrumentality of parties, it is still a secret of the gods.

Party government means ballots; Fascist government means surrender or bullets.

V

Experience shows that without organized and capably led parties the most outrageous persecutions of a people cannot be repelled. Look at the record in Italy and Germany. The scattered protests of individuals only result in their instant "liquidation." Happily in America we have had little experience in dealing with tyranny because there has been so little of it. But in the one experience we had there is a lesson. The Federalist Party, disdaining democracy, contemptuous of the common lot, and thoroughly organized as a party brilliantly led, resented the creation of a party of opposition, and described it as a "faction." Consciously or not, federalism tended toward fascism. Thus the seditious law of the Adams administration, the persecution and imprisonment of editors who dared challenge the pretensions of those in power was an attempt, through terrorism, to close the mouths of critics. The men singled out for persecution would have been helpless, acting as individuals, just as the victims of tyranny in Italy were helpless in combating the tyranny of Mussolini. But happily, in America, a party of opposition had been created under whose banner all the victims of oppression could constitutionally assemble for concerted, wisely directed, and stubborn action. That attempt to set aside the Bill of Rights was defeated by a political party.

It was after the collapse of the Federalist Party, when an "era of good feeling" had developed, that some urged the amalgamation of all parties into one and others rejoiced that there was but one party. This amalgamation could not be perfected by governmental decree, as in Italy, Germany, and Spain, but only by consent of the people. Jefferson opposed this idea utterly. "I am no believer in the amalgamation of parties,"

he wrote, "nor do I consider it as either desirable or useful for the public. . . . They [parties] are censors of the conduct of each other, and useful watchmen for the public." And again he wrote: "In every free and deliberative society there must, from the nature of man, be opposite parties." And again: "The division [into parties] ought to be fostered instead of being amalgamated; for take away this, and some more dangerous principle of division will take its place." And again: "Men have differed in opinion and been divided into parties by these opinions from the first origin of societies, and in all governments where they have been permitted freely to think and to speak."

With a full realization that in the composition of any political party there inevitably will be men who are mere self-seekers, not concerned with principles and policies, except insofar as they may advance them to public station. Jefferson knew that the division into parties is based primarily on principles and concepts of government. Thus he wrote: "Both of our political parties, at least the honest part of them, agree conscientiously in the same object—the public good; but they differ essentially in what they deem the means of promoting that good. One side thinks it best done by one composition of the governing powers; the other by a different one. With whatever opinion the body of the Nation concurs, that must prevail."

Thus does Jefferson describe the only practical, if not possible, way in which a democracy in a great country can function. Eliminate parties, and democratic countries, the people unorganized, undirected, undisciplined, would fall into chaos, and thus pave the way for the man with the bludgeon to establish order—resting on the buried liberties of the Nation.

But if political parties, so much derided by armchair theorists better acquainted with books than with men and more familiar with theories than with realities, are an essential part of the democratic machinery, there must be party leaders—and these are politicians.

VI

Even the most rigid of the critics are driven to admit that leaders in the higher strata of the parties may be of some service to the country; so they fall back on the assumption that the minor party workers down the line are engaged in rather disreputable business. The leader they praise at the top could not be there but for the tireless and usually unrewarded work of the minor politicians at the bottom. An organization, to be effective, must extend down to the lowest political unit—the precinct. The precinct committeeman, to be effective, must have the respect of the people in his precinct where everyone is known. He may be a young lawyer, or the corner grocer, or the village blacksmith, and in 9 cases out of 10 he is not an aspirant for office. He accepts the drudgery of the work because he is a good party man, interested, if only instinctively, in the principles and policies it proclaims. "Politics is a duty," said Jefferson; and the precinct committeeman render a service to the state.

If true of him, it is equally true of every other member of the party hierarchy; for without these local politicians, parties would speedily disintegrate, and with their disintegration, democracy inevitably would fail in functioning.

In the higher ranks of the hierarchy, the political leaders attain their position through a demonstration of their political capacity. On these devolve the task of formulating the political policies on which the party makes its appeal to the people; and the more consummate they are as politicians, the greater will be the effort to adopt policies in conformity with the public good or the public will. And that is democracy in action.

The sweeping charge of corruption against politicians is pure poppycock. Not that there are not corrupt politicians, any more than

that there are not corrupt businessmen, corrupt financiers, and immoral preachers. After all, the corrupt action of three ship-building companies which, through collusion in bidding, stole millions of dollars from the taxpayers was exposed and stopped by Josephus Daniels—a politician. And the corrupt action of some very respectable oil men in the case of Teapot Dome was exposed and stopped by Senator Tom Walsh—a politician. Cases where corruption among businessmen and financiers have been exposed by politicians acting for the Nation could be multiplied in America innumerable times.

Equally superficial and unfair and untrue is the charge of the theorists that politicians are incompetent. Too popular is the silly notion that while, of course, a doctor cannot take over the management of a factory, or a banker substitute for a lawyer, or a manufacturer assume the teaching in a studio, the doctor, the banker, and the manufacturer can, by some magic, master the intricate mysteries of government without experience or training. The drawing-room statesman in his library, the dilettante theorist in his study, and the village roustabout in the poolroom are often impatient with the incompetence of politicians and only wish they had a chance to straighten out the muddle. Such are living in a fool's paradise and suffering from a delusion of grandeur. After all, it was a man who had devoted his life to politics, not the financiers, who snatched the Nation from the edge of the precipice in the spring of 1933.

It is interesting to find that a man of the study, but an historian, like Oliver, shares this impatience with the critics when he says:

"If we eventually escape from our present perplexities, it will not be because theorists have discovered some fine new principle of salvation; or because newspapers have scolded and pointed angry fingers at this one or that; or because we, their readers, have become excited and have demanded that 'something must be done.' It will be because these decent, hard-working, cheerful, valiant, knock-about politicians, whose mysterious business it is to manage our affairs by breaking one another's heads, shall have carried on with their work as if nothing extraordinary was happening . . . and shall have 'jumbled something' out of their contentions that will be of advantage to their country. The notion that we can save ourselves without their help is an illusion; for politics is not one of those crafts that can be learned by the light of nature without an apprenticeship."

VII

It may be possible to lift the average in political life, but it never can be done so long as able young men, intellectually and temperamentally fit for public service, are led to believe that there is something rather shameful about it. How different in England, where a political career is considered one of service to the state and to society, and where the old nobility are prone to dedicate one of their sons to politics as a patriotic duty. The young man so dedicated begins his preparation at Oxford, concentrating on the studies that may be useful to the state, distinguishing himself perhaps in the debates of the Oxford Union, and passing speedily from the academic halls to Parliament, where he makes his career. Nothing in the old nobility of England sets it so much apart from that of other nations as its recognition of an obligation to participate in politics as a patriotic duty. The son is not thought vicious and smearing the family name or lowering its prestige by rendering public service in the halls of Westminster. The political tradition is handed down from generation to generation as in the case of Robert Cecil, the Minister of Elizabeth, whose descendants have carried on down to Salisbury, Balfour, and Lord Robert Cecil of today. Chatham meticulously trained his son, William Pitt,

and Holland found time to drill his son, Charles James Fox, and so, too, Gladstone, Chamberlain, Asquith, MacDonald, and Churchill have carried on the fine family tradition of giving in their sons men of great capacity to the state.

One finds it hard to understand the prejudices of Americans who think of themselves as "sensible" men, against political ambition in the young. Is it possible, as our enemies say, that we really feel that the only road to real distinction is in the acquisition of money, and that the prejudice against public life is because "you can't make money in politics"? Is it possible that the average American really feels that the accumulation of wealth is the only career worth while? Or that the American does not compare with the English in feeling any responsibility to organized society? Or does it spring from the fact that newspapers, columnists, the wisecrackers of stage comedies, and even novelists by insinuating that men in politics are fools or crooks have made the impression on half-baked minds that there is something low in public life?

That, I am sure, was not the opinion of Jefferson who urged the young to enter political life, drilled not a few, including Monroe, for public service, and hoped that the University of Virginia he was sponsoring would become a training field for public service.

What we need in America today is not the elimination of politicians but more politicians thoroughly trained for public service. There can be no finer career. But to render such service in the highest sense calls for a preparation beyond that of our forebears. The complications of modern social and business organization present intricate problems requiring special knowledge. Our fathers dealt with fundamental political principles but we of today, within those principles, can and must find solutions for economic and social problems. It is not enough now to saturate oneself in history and political philosophy; one must master the mysteries of economics and of sociology to deal with the political problems of this new day. And since modern invention has wiped out distance and made all nations neighbors, interdependent upon each other, the young man preparing for a political career should make a special study of international relations.

Thus prepared intellectually, he should study political psychology to the end that he may advance his cause intelligently through honest and wise propaganda. And nothing is more vital than a study of the science of political or party organization down to the precinct, for only through victories at the polls can he reach or hold a position in public life in a democracy. In brief, he must study to be—a politician.

VIII

To recapitulate: Democracies operate best through political parties.

Political parties function only through politicians.

Eliminate politicians and you wipe out parties.

Wipe out parties and you throw democracies into a state of unorganized, undisciplined chaos.

And when in a democracy the people are unorganized, undirected, undisciplined, the Fascist has his excuse and the tyrant appears to dominate the nation by brute force.

That is the reason the Mussolinis, Hitlers, and Francos hate and exterminate the politicians; and that is the reason it is so stupid in a democracy to join them in their hue and cry.

And that is the reason why the theorists and scoffers who sneer at representative government, political parties, and politicians are consciously, in some cases, and unconsciously, let us hope in most, making their contribution to the Fascist effort to destroy democracy in the United States.

SALARIES OF SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to endorse heartily an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Post approving increases in basic salaries paid the school teachers of the District of Columbia. Their basic pay has not been increased since 1924. I remember one of the first things I discovered after my assignment to the Committee on the District of Columbia, at the close of World War No. 1, was that the teachers in the public schools were still getting only their very low prewar rates of pay. We corrected that situation only after overcoming strenuous opposition which I never could understand.

Now, as World War No. 2 draws to a close, I find a very similar situation. School teachers in the District of Columbia are underpaid, especially considering the increased living costs resulting from the war. And those living costs are going to remain high for a very long time. An increase in the national debt from less than \$30,000,000,000 in the decade when the teachers' basic pay rates were last fixed to \$300,000,000,000 or more cannot but be accompanied by increased prices and increased living costs, and these will have to be met by increases in wages. I can see no escape from that conclusion.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial on Teachers' Pay be printed at this point in the Record, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEACHERS' PAY

The increases in salaries of school teachers recommended by the District Budget Office would add only \$80,400 to the total amount that would otherwise be paid out in the form of wartime bonuses. These bonuses, amounting to \$300 yearly for all teachers earning less than \$5,000, would be replaced by increases in basic rates of pay that would bring Washington salary schedules into line with those of teachers of comparable rank in other large cities. At present, Washington makes a very poor showing by contrast with cities such as Newark, New York, Detroit, Cincinnati, and San Francisco in respect to basic rates of pay. In case of 1-A elementary school teachers, the maximum salary paid (excluding bonuses) is the lowest, with one exception, to be found in 22 representative cities having populations in excess of 300,000.

Since basic salaries of Washington school teachers have remained unchanged since 1924, the need for a revision is plain, as a matter of equity. Moreover, if teachers have assurance that the end of the war will not entail reductions in earnings caused by loss of bonuses that have helped to relieve the pressure of rising living costs, they will be less attracted by offers of high pay in jobs of uncertain tenure. The District's teacher turn-over has risen from 4.34 percent of the teaching staff in 1939-40 to 10 percent in the last school year, 1943-44. Resignations of permanent and temporary employees totaled 209 in the latter year, and only 29 in 1939-40. While teachers in military service are among the temporary absentees, they accounted for only 15 percent of the total number leaving last year.

The authorities will eventually be faced, as Budget Officer Fowler points out in recommending the proposed new salary scale to the Commissioners, by a general revision in salaries in all departments of the District

Government. The city cannot afford to lose the services of valued employees, whether in responsible positions or in subordinate jobs, by following a penny-wise-pound-foolish policy on salary adjustments.

POSTWAR EMPLOYMENT POLICY IN SWEDEN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, to help understand the postwar economic policy of other nations, and in view of the wide public interest in the Full Employment bill introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself in the Senate, and by Mr. PATMAN in the House of Representatives, I have had the Department of Commerce prepare a study on postwar employment policy in Sweden. This study gives emphasis to the responsibilities of the government in maintaining full employment.

The Chairman of the Swedish Commission for Postwar Economic Planning, Gunnar Myrdal, has stated that the "basic idea in postwar economic planning is that the State is finally responsible for the maintenance of a high and stable level of employment in industry." The Bank of Sweden Committee, reporting late in 1943, found that the "The objective of economic policy in the immediate postwar period can be defined, in general terms, to be the quickest possible restoration of a satisfactory living standard and the maintenance of full employment, with that orientation of production which offers most favorable prospects possible for the future development of Swedish enterprises."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Department of Commerce memorandum on "Sweden: Full Employment Policy" may be printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum is as follows:

SWEDEN—"FULL-EMPLOYMENT" POLICY

The Swedish Government long since recognized the gravity of the problem of large scale unemployment which might follow the cessation of hostilities in Europe. Where measures affecting any phase of Swedish postwar economic activities are considered, all probable effects of the measure in question receive very full consideration in every case, and the employment factor is now the object of most careful attention from numerous governmental organizations in Sweden. It also forms an important element in most, if not all, of the numerous discussions of postwar problems which are a current feature of the Swedish press. As one writer has stated, full employment is synonymous with good business conditions in Sweden at present.

In Sweden, when legislation in the economic field is in prospect, it is usual for the government (Cabinet) to appoint special committees, to analyze the problems involved and submit recommendations as to what action should be proposed to parliament, by the government, for discussion and action.

Such committees are usually composed of representatives of the appropriate government departments and of private individuals who represent the interests concerned or who are particularly familiar with the problems under investigation. Considering the

relative size of the population of Sweden (6,500,000), such investigations are surprisingly thorough and informative.

For the present, the progress of Swedish plans for insuring full employment can best be judged from the published reports of the organizations concerned with postwar planning, from statements made from time to time by public officials and informed private individuals, and from published economic studies in which the employment question is discussed. Appropriations of limited amounts have already been made for relief of future unemployment, however.

INTEREST IN POSTWAR FULL EMPLOYMENT AROUSED

Swedish economists have been occupied with the question of postwar employment for several years. As early as the fall of 1942 Prof. Bertil Ohlin (now head of the Department of Commerce of the Swedish Government), published an article on Swedish Postwar Problems, in which he stated:

"Perhaps the most burning economic question in Sweden, as in other countries, immediately after the war will be to achieve as mild a transition from war production to peace production as possible." He then stated that, in the postwar period, if private enterprises were to maintain employment by repair and conversion projects, they could stabilize purchasing power and maintain trade, while Government initiative would no doubt be found necessary to provide increased employment.

About a year later Prof. Gustav Cassel (since deceased), expressed a rather opposite (conservative) view, recognizing the need for maintaining employment, but recommending that this be accomplished by government aid to private industry, to increase production.

EARLY ANALYSIS OF POSTWAR EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

By this time the question of postwar conditions, and particularly their employment aspects, were being discussed in all circles in Sweden, and numerous bodies, governmental and private, were studying the problems involved. At a meeting of the Swedish cabinet on March 19, 1943, the Minister of Finance proposed that a number of investigating bodies be appointed to analyze postwar economic problems. The suggestion was promptly accepted. Among the subjects assigned for investigation in which the question of full employment was a particularly prominent factor were:

Release of manpower through liquidation of emergency administration and demobilization of defense and emergency forest-work personnel by the Labor Market Commission.

Inventorying and planning of public works by the Investment Experts.

Building-industry situation under postwar conditions; manpower reserve, employment prospects by the Experts on Dwelling-House Production.

Inventorying and planning of emergency work in agriculture, agricultural employment prospects, Agricultural Committee of 1942.

Inventorying and planning of forest emergency work. Forest-work employment prospects by the Forest Administration.

Industrial investment plans, and other subjects in which the employment question has a prominent place, by the Board of Trade in conjunction with the Industrial Research Institute.

All of these organizations, and five others engaged with questions in which the employment problem was perhaps less prominent, but by no means absent, worked under the Ministry of Finance. It was decided to use the material assembled by these organizations as the basis for further work by a special governmental commission for postwar planning.

Their reports were for the most part essentially factual, with few recommendations. The report of the Agricultural Committee of 1943, composed of representatives of all branches of Swedish economic life, which was submitted on August 31, 1943, went somewhat further. While of course tentative, its recommendations concerning employment activities in the field of agriculture merit attention. It advocated State subsidies to farmers, for bringing new land into cultivation, removal of stones, improvement of drainage, soil, farm buildings, etc., aggregating 40,000,000 crowns (\$9,500,000) per year, three-fourths of which would go to farms of less than 20 hectares (50 acres). Government loans to the extent of 35,000,000 crowns (\$8,300,000) were also proposed.

The Labor Market Committee submitted a report on investments in April 1944, which is discussed below.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR POSTWAR PLANNING

While most of the studies of the above committees were still incomplete, they had progressed sufficiently for the Government, in October 1943, to request a special appropriation of 10,000,000 crowns (\$2,400,000), to cover the cost of planning public works, which would have an estimated total cost of from 250,000,000 crowns (\$60,000,000) to 300,000,000 crowns (\$70,000,000). This appropriation was made on December 8, 1943, under an amendment of 1941 to the Swedish constitution, permitting the establishment of an emergency budget containing appropriations which may be necessary in an economic crisis or other emergency situation, for which Parliament has the right to indicate the manner of their disposal.

PURPOSES OF POSTWAR PLANNING

The initial report of the Bank of Sweden committee (which worked under the bank, and not, as in the case of the other committees, under the Ministry of Finance), while necessarily somewhat indefinite as to what specific measures would be required in the postwar foreign-exchange field, clearly expressed the ultimate aim of Swedish economic policy in its report of November 22, 1943, to the board of directors of the bank, in which the Committee found that:

"The objective of economic policy in the immediate postwar period can be defined, in general terms, to be the quickest possible restoration of a satisfactory living standard and the maintenance of full employment, with that orientation of production which offers the most favorable prospects possible for the future development of Swedish enterprises."

The final report of the Bank of Sweden, on Currency and Price Stabilization (submitted to the government on March 30, 1944) confirmed the above view by stating "In the formulation and application of the current monetary policy program, it has been recognized stabilization of employment should be included in the objectives of monetary policy."

Parliament, in 1943, had outlined the establishment, at an appropriate moment, of a special organ the task of which is to inquire how the conversion of industry to peace production should be accomplished, what practical measures may be taken for this purpose, and how the postwar social problems are to be solved. This applied particularly to the (government) Commission for Postwar Economic Planning, to be concerned primarily with Swedish economic policy, but working in close collaboration with a State reconstruction office, formulating policy pertaining to, and administering, Sweden's participation in the export of goods and material for use in international reconstruction work, and a committee for international relief, which would coordinate and organize humanitarian relief activity.

SWEDISH GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHES POSTWAR PLANNING COMMISSION

Pursuant to the above program, on February 11, 1944, the Commission for Post-war Economic Planning was established, under the chairmanship of Prof. Gunnar Myrdal, with considerable latitude in its power to choose its objectives, determine its procedure, and carry on its work independently. The general secretary of the commission stated:

"There are no differences of opinion as to the goal of economic policy: Full employment. . . . The dominance of the problem of employment has given a natural direction to the investigations undertaken on behalf of the Department of Finance."

The Commission for Postwar Economic Planning established 10 subcommittees to analyze specific subjects, as follows:

- I. Monetary and foreign trade.
- II. Planning and organization of promotion of employment.
- III. Opportunities of investment.
- IV. Mobility of labor, etc.
- V. Expansion of consumption and qualitative control.
- VI. Direct relief activities.
- VII. Raw materials.
- VIII. Housing.
- IX. Agriculture.
- X. Control of monopolies.

FORMATIVE PERIOD OF POSTWAR PLANNING POLICY

Shortly after its establishment the commission received the Labor Market Commission's extensive report on investments. In its preliminary comment on this report, the planning commission stated that investment activity occupies a key position among policies intended to counteract depression and stimulate employment and that it is desirable that postwar investments and exports should somewhat surpass prewar levels. It added that it was then impossible to foresee all contingencies and the primary task of the commission is to set up guiding principles.

The planning commission, while it did not analyze the specific recommendations of the report submitted to it, pointed out the desirability of using available unemployed manpower for work on needed facilities of public utility, such as airports for international service, a change from left-hand to right-hand driving as the rule of the road, etc., with the reservation that it could be considered better to keep people employed in their regular activity, through state aid, providing their work contributes to fulfilling real needs, than to transfer them to other activities, such as building construction and public utilities. These principles were elaborated in a memorandum of August 1944, by the executive secretary of the commission, Karin Kock. The study of the question of investments, public and private, is being continued actively.

An address by Professor Myrdal, the head of Planning Commission, further summarizes the objectives of the Commission and illustrates the degree to which full employment dominates its efforts. He stated that the basic idea in postwar economic planning is that the State is finally responsible for the maintenance of a high and stable level of employment in industry. In Sweden, he believes, postwar depression can be avoided if the government pursues as wise a policy in the future as it has during the war years, entailing a continued active policy of governmental control and regulation of economic life.

Unemployment policy would have to be planned within the framework of monetary and foreign trade policy. If exports reach and exceed prewar levels and if sufficient foreign raw materials become available, the unemployment question will solve itself, but possible emergencies must be prepared for.

While the stabilization of housing construction at a high level would be desirable and necessary, a well-prepared portfolio of public works projects would be needed to meet the requirements of full employment.

He did not believe that control of the rate of interest would suffice to direct the trend of investments. He proposed the creation of a board comprising governmental, industrial, and private representatives to give advice to investors on the subject of so directing all investments as to make them serve the maximum national economic and social purposes.

BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS FOR INSURING EMPLOYMENT

The Swedish budget for the fiscal year 1944-45 included a "General Emergency Budget I." The latter, in addition to items for international rehabilitation and for support of refugees, contained an appropriation of 100,000,000 crowns (\$23,800,000) for postwar economic emergency measures. Two additional measures, of a provisional nature, designated as "General Emergency Budgets II and III" were approved in principle but not included in the actual budget, because of their tentative nature. Number II comprised a tentative appropriation of 124,400,000 crowns (\$29,600,000) for operating account, and 154,500,000 crowns (\$36,800,000) for capital account, while number III comprised 431,100,000 crowns (\$102,600,000) for operating account and 22,400,000 crowns (\$54,000,000) for capital account.

The tentative appropriations thus totaled \$932,400,000 crowns (\$222,000,000) but their use was conditioned on certain contingencies. Thus the entire amounts of number II would be available after July 1, 1944, if the supply and labor-market situations permitted or the labor situation required, though a portion would be available beforehand, for preparatory measures. The amounts contained in number III would only become available (after permission of Parliament had been secured) when an unemployment emergency had actually arisen. Details of the treatment of these items in the 1945-46 budget are not yet available.

Among projects on the program of the Swedish Government, some (if not all) of which are already under way, are:

A large plant to produce synthetic rubber from wood derivatives.

The erection of additional blast furnace capacity for the utilization of Swedish iron ore.

Expansion of copper ore and building additional refinery capacity.

Expansion of exploitation of Swedish nickel deposits.

The Government is also interested in the question of importation and distribution of petroleum products.

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN PLANNING POSTWAR EMPLOYMENT IN SWEDEN

A most important report of the Commission on Postwar Planning is that of October 4, 1944, which carefully analyzes living standards in Sweden and makes proposals for benefits to unemployed.

The analysis of the Commission shows that considerable confusion is inherent in present arrangements under which unemployment relief may be payable from employees' union insurance funds, assisted by state subsidies, and from national and local public funds. The recommendations of the Commission include: (1) a governmental investigation of the minimum outlay necessary to assure the maintenance of acceptable living standards and consideration of the findings in the formulation of the general social policy which is now in preparation; (2) that the appropriate governmental organs prepare a plan for lessening the number of cases in which local

poor relief is paid rather than relief under national legislation; (3) that a proposal be prepared for unifying the central administration of unemployment insurance and relief; (4) that the government submit a proposition for an increase of the daily relief and other benefits from unemployment insurance funds and for a lessening of restrictions on the payment of rent allowances; (5) that a proposal be submitted for better protection through unemployment insurance and unemployment relief against losses because of part-time work; (6) that a plan be prepared for voluntary insurance against unemployment on the part of certain groups the occupations of which involve unusual risk of unemployment; and (7) that unemployment benefits to individuals be increased when unemployment is widespread.

The whole question of the organization of social welfare in Sweden is under consideration by another governmental body, a report of which is expected to embody a general scheme of compulsory unemployment insurance. This report will not be ready for some time to come, and the proposals will hardly be written into law and made effective before 1949. In view of the situation, the Commission on Postwar Economic Planning made only some stop-gap proposals regarding the existing system. These proposals deal with reforms that it feels must not be postponed.

A report by the Planning Commission, also of October 9, 1944, dealing with balancing of investments primarily, contains valuable views on the current situation in Sweden as concerns the entire problem of full employment and is a valuable supplement of the Commission's earlier reports.

The report on the coordination of investment activities with unemployment policy takes note of the decisive character of investments in the maintenance of economic activity dividing them into four main fields—public works, producers goods, stocks of goods, and housing—with a fifth category consisting of durable consumers' goods. It is itself concerned with investments of private industry in durable producers' goods—buildings, plants, and machinery.

The matter of adjusting private capital expenditures to the needs of the national economy in view of cyclical changes is one of difficulty in comparison with that of most kinds of public building projects. Nevertheless, such expenditures are not at all so geared to current production requirements that they cannot be increased or decreased to meet the needs of depression and boom times. Repair works, to take a single instance, can often be deferred from times of greater to times of lesser general business activity. In agriculture various rationalization measures can appropriately be undertaken in time of relative slump.

A difficulty of obtaining integrated planning lies in the diversity of public and private agencies engaged in the making of plans. Needed coordination can be achieved with respect to industry by means of voluntary coordination, by measures of incentive on the part of the Government, or by direct public control. The Commission does not believe that Government control will in fact stimulate investment during depression. Measures of incentive, such as appropriately designed tax laws, properly managed interest rates, and direct contributions may be useful. Voluntary cooperation among private enterprisers may result in beneficial accomplishment. Attention needs to be given to arrangements for better geographical distribution of industry and for avoidance of unfortunate segregation—such as industries employing chiefly men or chiefly women.

Employment is still being maintained at a high level in Sweden. In agriculture a shortage of labor exists, since the trend of

population to urban areas has been marked. A reversal of this trend would perhaps provide employment for a considerable number of eventual city unemployed. In forestry, the continued intense demand for wood, to replace coal and liquid fuels formerly imported, for the time being causes a labor scarcity. In some lines there is a trend toward unemployment, however. Shipping is idle, to a considerable extent, there is some prospect of difficulty in maintaining full-scale building activities and the Government has had to assist a prominent iron-mining company in rock-stripping activities in open-cut mines, and in storage of extracted ore, because of the cessation of iron-ore exports. The background of the employment opportunities of Swedish industry may be estimated from the article *Swedish Industries' Trends in Wartime*, in the November 4, 1944, issue of *Foreign Commerce Weekly*.

GOVERNMENT NEED OF PRIVATE BRAIN POWER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an article entitled "Government Needs Its Private Brain Power," written by him and published in the May issue of *Forbes*, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUSTICE FOR POLAND—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a statement entitled "Justice for Poland," by Senator MEAD, which appears in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE'S PLACE IN THE NEW WORLD—ADDRESS BY LOUIS BROMFIELD

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address entitled "Palestine's Place in the New World," delivered by Louis Bromfield at a dinner sponsored by the New Zionist Organization of America, in New York City, March 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an excerpt from an article entitled "The Case Against Compulsory Peacetime Military Training," by Lt. Col. Roscoe S. Conkling, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial entitled, "Pandora's Box at Unclo," from the *Washington Post* of May 1, 1945, and the column, "Today and Tomorrow," by Walter Lippmann, from the *Washington Post* of May 3, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE U. S. S. "OREGON"

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an article entitled "Restore the 'Old Oregon' as Patriotic Symbol," from the *Argonaut* of April 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FRANKING PRIVILEGE FOR ANNA ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 906) granting a franking privilege to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, which was, in line 5, after the word "signature", to insert "or facsimile thereof."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, my attention was otherwise engaged at the moment the matter was laid before the Senate. Is this in connection with the bill granting the franking privilege?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Chair has just laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill granting the same franking privilege to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt which the Congress in 1940 granted to Mrs. Cleveland, Mrs. Harrison, Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Taft, and Mrs. Coolidge.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has correctly stated the situation, and I have no quarrel with it. I should not wish to put myself in the position of discriminating against the widow of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I cannot help saying, however, that I have some question as to the wisdom of the precedent. I have some question as to the wisdom of granting to any one the unlimited power of free use of the mail of the United States. I cannot very well raise the question now without voicing something in the way of discrimination against Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and I have no desire to do that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the bills heretofore passed granting the franking privilege to widows of Presidents, including my mother, were very much too broad, and while I think we should follow the precedent in this case, I do not think the precedent should be followed again.

The difficulty really is not with the House amendment, which permits the use of a facsimile signature. The original bill did not make that provision, but in 1940 the privilege was extended to all the living widows of deceased Presidents. The trouble is with the breadth of the original bill, and the same measures have been passed granting the privilege to the widows of all Presidents. The language was:

That all mail matter sent by the post shall be conveyed free of postage.

Of course, that covers first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail matter. It could be argued that it would cover all sorts of political literature, and everything else that might possibly be sent through the mail. I did not think it was intended for that purpose. No widows of Presidents have ever used it for such a purpose. It is clearly intended to cover personal correspondence and personal mail matter. I have no doubt it will be so used by Mrs. Roosevelt.

I think it is wise, however, to call attention to the fact that the language is too broad, and, in my opinion, at some time all the acts should be revised. The privilege differs materially from that of a Representative or Senator, who, of course, can send through the mail only matter of an official character. It seems to me clear that when this privilege is granted to anyone else it should apply solely to personal mail, and I think it has always been understood by the recipients that it was for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate next week in order that I may attend the flood-control meeting to be held at Little Rock, Ark.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Arkansas that he may be excused for a week? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is excused.

O. P. A. AND THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, apropos of what I shall have to say in a few moments concerning the operations of the O. P. A. and related agencies, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the *Record* two telegrams which I have received from packers of my own State giving expression to the effect new orders promulgated by the O. P. A. will have upon them. These telegrams are typical of many statements from other portions of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., May 3, 1945.

Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Under new restrictions on non-Federal inspected packing plants our Tulsa plant will lose approximately \$5,000 to \$6,000 per month on overall operations.

BANFIELD BROS. PACKING CO.

BLACKWELL, OKLA., May 1, 1945.

Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate:

Control order No. 1 forces us to consider closing our plant. Compliance, which means reduced volume at prohibitive costs, impossible; this is discrimination against non-inspected plants. If we are forced to operate at the announced quotas or quit, black market operations will be the only means for supplying meat to some parts of Oklahoma as we are supplying all the meat to some communities. The base years '38 to '41 plus O. P. A. audit to get only even break gives no recognition to plant improvements or revised operation methods, and the multitude of regulations issued gives the O. P. A. too great an opportunity to snare packers who might submit to an audit. What can we do to help you in the fight you are making for the industry?

TURVEY PACKING CO.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, for weeks past Senate and House subcommittees have been conducting investigations into the food shortages as developed under the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and the other related and interrelated agencies dealing directly and indirectly with the wartime production and consumption of food. The revelations disclose a sordid story of incompetence and premeditated efforts to destroy American ideals and American institutions. I should like to take this opportunity to extend my earnest congratulations to these committees and voice my approval of their activities.

Our precarious food situation is the natural outgrowth of a dictatorship created under the cover of a claimed war necessity, and built upon a background of human emotions, sufferings, and fear.

Americans are stirred by the emotions of war, burdened with the worry over loved ones in the armed forces, and carry with them the fear to protest the arbitrary dictates of a bureaucracy lest they be accused of a lack of patriotism in this dark hour of war. There are those in O. P. A. who fully appreciate this psychological opportunity and have taken advantage of it to improve their technique of control.

The congressional committees, however, have spoken, and they have spoken boldly. The chairman of the Senate subcommittee has charged the O. P. A. with intentions and actions that require its entire executive personnel to deny and defend, or leave office in shame and disgrace.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has been quoted by the press and on the radio as saying that prevailing meat conditions may have been due to incompetence, but that he is more inclined to believe that it has been part of a general scheme by certain O. P. A. cliques to drive small packers and meat processors out of business in order to concentrate the meat industry in the hands of a few large concerns, and then when that has been done, come to Congress with a demand for Federal regulatory powers over those few on the grounds that they are a practical monopoly, but with an ultimate purpose of getting a toehold for a permanent planned economy controlled from Washington.

If this shocking statement represents the considered judgment of the Senate committee, when I say it is the duty and obligation of this body to demand the resignation of those responsible for the operations of O. P. A. It is inconceivable that this un-American philosophy should permeate an office of public trust. If the Congress shall fail to back up its committees when the evidence appears to be so plain and the charge so serious, then it must accept the consequences inherent in the loss of public confidence.

President Truman in his zeal to allay unrest and dissension on the home front has termed the criticisms of O. P. A. as "irresponsible." In other words, the President says that these congressional committees have acted in an irresponsible manner.

I am indeed sorry the President is using his office to deter or interfere with a congressional investigation. The exposure of the facts, under any circumstances, and the condemnation of dishonesty or inefficiency in Government have always been and always will be the greatest insurance to the preservation of democracy. It is likewise as important to defend fearlessly those unjustly accused, but to condemn these congressional committees in the present case as "irresponsible" is unwarranted by the evidence.

Advertising man Bowles was brought to Washington to sell a smelly mess to the public. It appears that salesman Bowles has now given the President a selling.

Hundreds of cases attest to the correctness of the findings of the committees. The House committee's report says it is true that a substantial majority of all

the meat consumed in New York City is furnished by the black market. This committee reports that the going black market price for beef carcasses in New York was reliably given as \$100 above O. P. A. ceiling prices.

The dishonesty of O. P. A. was exemplified last December when the housewives of the country were double-crossed by canceling all unused ration-stamp reserves, which had been built up through sacrifice and frugality. It seems that O. P. A. felt it necessary to cancel these stamps to compensate for its laxity of rationing during the weeks preceding the national election. O. P. A.'s removal of restrictions prior to the election and the reimposition of the restrictions immediately following the election was one of the sorriest spectacles of political dishonesty ever witnessed by the American public.

Only a few days ago protests came to my office from the clothing merchants of the country concerning a proposed new maximum price order covering clothing and clothing accessories. It was pointed out that the issuance of the order without an opportunity being given the merchants for the adjustment of their existing inventories would work an unfair and undue hardship. The protests were submitted to the O. P. A. On April 17, I was given assurance by letter from the O. P. A. that its proposed price order would not be effective until June 1, 1945. Three days later, on April 20, the order was issued, effective as of April 28, notwithstanding the prior assurance given to me which had been passed on to some of the merchants who were affected.

Taking further advantage of the chaos and confusion that surrounds the meat shortage, O. P. A. has issued orders arbitrarily cutting all local packers who are not federally inspected to a beef-slaughtering quota of 75 percent of their 1944 operations. I am in receipt of complaints from local packers that this order will force the closing of many plants because of the reduced volume at prohibitive cost. The order, of course, is clear discrimination against nonfederally inspected plants. When the matter was taken up with the O. P. A., what do you suppose the suggestion was? It was that the plants could become federally inspected, regardless of the local character of their business, and that State and municipal inspections should be done away with. When it was pointed out that this would result in a considerable cost to these local packers, we were told that they could obtain a loan for the necessary additional capital.

No doubt we are all familiar with these personal experiences, and to say that criticisms of what has led to them are irresponsible is indeed unwarranted. The common-sense fact is that O. P. A. should be abolished, and I say that with confidence that the future will prove the correctness of the observation.

The unrealistic and arbitrary treatment of the oil industry is a shocking example of the ineptitude of O. P. A. and, in fact, all bureaus, to control and regulate business and industry. Time after time the O. P. A. has been furnished convincing and unanswerable proof that the oil resources of this country are be-

ing exhausted at prices below cost for a substantial portion of our oil production. The Office of Economic Stabilization found this to be a fact and directed that subsidies be invoked to fill the gap at the expense of the Public Treasury. The experience of the oil industry is typical of the understanding displayed by O. P. A. officials with respect to the cattle raisers, the dairy industry, and dozens of other units of our business and industrial economy.

The testimony before the Senate subcommittee of Mr. Thomas Emerson, who was at the time deputy administrator for enforcement, is the personification of arrogance, ignorance, and incompetence. When confronted with the information that from 80 percent to 90 percent of the meat consumption was being furnished by black markets, his only answer was that he believed the statement to be grossly exaggerated. This young man has now been rewarded for the good job he did for O. P. A. by being promoted to the position of general counsel of the Office of Economic Stabilization.

I cannot refrain from appealing to the Chief Executive to take cognizance of these situations before they further impair the morale of our people.

On principle the O. P. A. is anti-American in its very conception. It is founded on a distrust of the people. It has from the beginning operated on the theory that Americans had to be made to conform to wartime necessities. O. P. A. has thrived on the preachment that the rich and the strong would take advantage of the poor and the weak. The story of America has been one of surmounting the ever-present obstacles, but never in its long and glorious history have the people been found in default to their responsibilities when the future of America was at stake. Almost a year ago I said on the floor of the Senate, and I again repeat, that O. P. A. is counter to our concepts of constitutional government and must always be a fountainhead of potential evil.

O. P. A. has been peopled from its inception with executive personnel of un-American ideals. Leon Henderson, an economic theorist whose philosophies lead far to the left of center, set the pattern. Such men as Richard V. Gilbert, who holds that private business is incompetent to manage itself and that the Federal Government must take over the control and direction if not the ownership of all business, helped build the structure. Tom Tippet, an organizer for the League for Industrial Democracy and former manager of the Communist Federated Press, and others of similar ideals, have been principal lieutenants in the operations of O. P. A.

The emergency price law was supported by a majority in Congress because of the fear of uncontrolled inflation. This, of course, is a problem so immense in its proportions as to terrify the most sturdy. But, a desertion of constitutional principles, even in time of war, is not the answer to the problem.

Our experiment with O. P. A. has resulted in driving our domestic economy underground. It has brought about an uncontrolled inflation, the extent of which can scarcely be estimated. Some

indication of the underground inflation with which we have been saddled can be gained from the fact that since 1940 the currency in circulation has increased more than 250 percent. At present there is afloat in the country approximately \$22,000,000,000, which is about \$16,000,000,000 more than the average for the 11-year period prior to 1931. I think it is commonly agreed that the excessive amount of currency in circulation is the medium by which this huge black market is being conducted, which is merely another name for inflation.

I know there are some who will contend that the inflationary trend as the economic result of war has been minimized by our attempt at price control. A case for this argument can be made on paper. The retail establishments prominently display maximum price lists, but as a practical matter this means nothing when a substantial majority of the volume of retail business is being carried on in a black market, where the uncontrolled and unconscionable inflation cannot be seen or estimated. Abolish O. P. A. and this inflation under which we are suffering will come out in the open, and public condemnation of the profiteer and the hoarder will have more corrective effect than all the laws that Congress can pass.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MOORE. I gladly yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I merely wish to offer a suggestion to the Senator in connection with his statement. At a time when we are apparently short of meat products in this country, there are more live cattle on the hoof in America today than there ever have been before. There are approximately 82,000,000 head of hogs in this country, and about 50,000,000 sheep. The O. P. A., after being presented with testimony before our committee, had only one answer to make. Our committee conducted hearings for some four weeks. After the O. P. A. was presented with testimony to the effect that we have plenty of meat in this country, if it is properly distributed, and that we also have a large black market, which the committee is so desperately trying to locate and to persuade the O. P. A. to get rid of, the only answer those gentlemen could make to us and the only answer they did make to us was, "give us more money to hire more investigators."

Mr. MOORE. That is always the answer.

Mr. President, the honest people of America are hungry. They are without food in a land of plenty. By the activities of an un-American bureaucracy, a substantial portion of our people has been converted into black-market operators and hoarders.

The least Congress can do is to uphold the hands of its committees that have been courageous enough to disclose these sordid facts, and demand a complete change of the executive personnel of this wartime bureau, which has so miserably failed to meet its obligations. The fail-

ure of O. P. A. has not been the result of honest mistakes. On the contrary, its failure is founded on the mental dishonesty of those who would change the American way of life. Its failure is a story of the inflated egos of little "dictators," who have set themselves up as judge, jury, and prosecutor.

Fundamentally, O. P. A. is a failure because it is contrary to our constitutional form of Government.

RUSSIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Molotov, Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union, is now in America, at San Francisco. His presence furnishes the opportunity for an exchange of ideas that can be mutually helpful between our two countries. I refer in particular to the possibility of developing by mutual consent opportunities for access to the facts with respect to conditions prevailing in areas in eastern Europe now subject to Russian control. The scope of this exchange of ideas is far broader than the scope of the document in preparation at San Francisco. In that Conference the delegates are engaged in constructing a piece of machinery to maintain peace in the future. However, the whole problem of formulating that peace and at the same time maintaining cordial relations and common purposes between the Allies while doing so, lies outside the scope of the work at San Francisco.

I pay the fullest tribute to Russian bravery and military genius. Indeed, the effort of the Russian people throughout this war has been beyond all praise, and every American recognizes this fact. Because I hold the Russians in this high esteem, I feel that two strong nations, Russia and America, can talk to each other in complete candor, and should so talk. It is only by such candor that understanding between men and nations can be reached. Thus, in what I say there is no desire to criticize so staunch an ally. There is an earnest desire, however, that we should eliminate a factor which is likely, if allowed to proceed unchecked, to damage our relations. I feel that our course in dealing with the Soviet Union in the past has not been characterized by that outspoken candor on the part of the United States which to my mind is the only basis for mutual understanding.

I submit that the time has come for us to change this attitude. The fighting in Europe is over or nearly over. The time has come when incidents between the Allies can more easily cause strained nerves and misunderstanding. If there was justification previously for not speaking our minds freely to our Russian allies, that justification is now past. I am profoundly convinced, as must be anyone who studies the international situation, that future peace hinges upon a firm understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union. I differ

with the administration only in respect to the method of achieving that understanding.

In the past, even with knowledge, we may have had misunderstandings. We use terms having different meanings from those used by our Russian allies. But foreign policy is founded upon the attitudes of the people of one nation toward those of other nations; and such attitudes must be founded upon facts, not upon rumors.

A large section of central and eastern Europe is occupied by the armies of the Soviet Union. In that vast area our knowledge of what is taking place is rudimentary or zero. That is so in spite of the fact that in certain instances we are parties to the armistice terms and we share in the responsibility for Allied control. Let us assess for a minute what we do know about those areas. Perhaps the administration has facts which are not available to us. I am speaking as one who has carefully followed the press reports. In Bulgaria we have apparently a small military mission, supplemented by State Department representatives. We understand that the mission is restricted in its movements and in its ability to investigate conditions. The case in Rumania is slightly different. We understand that there our military mission has wider scope of obtaining information, but is still restricted in movements and it is not permitted to have press representatives to keep the American people informed of conditions. So far as is reported, there are no Americans in Budapest and there are none in Vienna, in spite of the fact that a new government has come into being and in spite of the fact that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Great Britain, and ourselves have united in a policy toward Austria in the Moscow declaration. We have a certain responsibility in respect to Austria's future, through that undertaking, while we have no participation on the spot in what is going on in Vienna.

I shall continue with the list. There are no representatives of the United States—military or press—in Poland, so far as I have been able to ascertain. That is so in spite of the fact that in the United States there are millions of citizens of Polish descent, with the most vital interest in the fate of the people of that nation. Neither have I heard of American reporters or military representatives being in the small Baltic states.

This gives an idea of the extent of our ignorance as to what is taking place. There are American citizens vitally interested in each one of those areas, but there is no way of satisfying their interest. This lack of knowledge makes a fertile ground for the wildest of rumors. Suspicion grows on lack of knowledge. Such suspicion will breed recrimination, ill feeling, and even profound distrust. It is believed that the only way by which such evil results can be avoided is by having light thrown on those obscure corners. In the interest of mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and ourselves, we cannot urge too strongly that representatives of the American press be allowed to visit and circulate

freely in those lands of eastern Europe and be allowed to report conditions with the fullest frankness, so that mistrust and suspicion can be eliminated. It is believed that if the administration could arrange to gain Mr. Molotov's consent to such action, it would be a profound contribution to cordial relations and understanding between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, with the courtesy of the Senator from Nevada, who has the floor, I merely wish to say that I think the Senator from Michigan has performed a real service today in bringing into the open on the Senate floor this very delicate problem. His suggested approach to it, an approach of candor and fairness, is the only sound approach which can be made. If, during the concluding days of the present war, we may have American representatives stationed in many of the countries in which we have mutual interests, a great deal may be done toward promoting friendly relationships among the Allies. I think the Senator from Michigan is to be commended for bringing this matter into the open, and for the contribution which he has made.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his statement.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement entered into on Monday last, Senate bill 2 is the unfinished business, and the Chair lays the bill before the Senate.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Aid Airport Act."

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. As used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) "Administrator" means the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

(b) "Airport" means any area of land or water which is designed for the landing and take-off of aircraft and all appurtenant areas necessary for buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way.

(c) "Airport development" means (1) any construction work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing an airport or portion thereof, including the construction, alteration, and repair of airport administrative buildings and the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards; and (2) any acquisition of lands or property interests, air rights, or navigation easement therein which is necessary to permit any such construction work or prevent or limit the establishment of airport hazards, but does not include the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars.

(d) "Airport hazard" means any structure or object of natural growth located on or in the vicinity of an airport, or any use of land near an airport, which obstructs the air space required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking off at the airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking-off of aircraft.

(e) "Authorized project" means a project included in the national airport plan provided for in section 6 and, in the case of projects under the urban program, a project which has been selected and authorized as provided in subsection 7 (a).

(f) "Class 3 and smaller airports" means all airports which, as to size, lay-out, and facilities, are not properly classifiable as class 4 or higher-class airports according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin "Airport Design" dated April 1, 1944.

(g) "Class 4 and larger airports" means all airports which, as to size, lay-out, and facilities, are properly classifiable as class 4 or higher-class airports according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin "Airport Design" dated April 1, 1944.

(h) "Military or naval aircraft" means aircraft owned and operated by the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Coast Guard, or the United States Marine Corps.

(i) "Population" means the population according to the latest decennial census of the United States.

(j) "Project" means a proposal for the accomplishment of certain airport development with respect to a particular airport.

(k) "Project costs" means all necessary costs involved in accomplishing a project under this act, including those of making field surveys, preparation of plans and specifications, supervision and inspection of construction work, procurement of the accomplishment of such work by contract, and acquisition of property interests, and also including administrative and other incidental costs incurred by a State airport agency or project sponsor specifically in connection with the accomplishment of a project, and which would not have been incurred otherwise.

(l) "Public agency" means any agency of the Federal Government or of a State, any municipality or other political subdivision, any body politic or public corporation supported by taxes, or any department, commission, board, or official of a municipal or county government, which in the opinion of the Administrator has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program herein authorized.

(m) "Public airport" means any airport which is used or to be used for public purposes without unjust discrimination, under the control of a public agency, the landing area of which is publicly owned.

(n) "Sponsor" means any non-Federal public agency which meets the requirements prescribed by the Administrator for sponsorship of a project under this act and enters into a contract with the Federal Government, satisfactory to the Administrator, agreeing to operate and maintain the airport to be developed.

(o) "State" means any State of the United States of America, excluding the District of Columbia.

(p) "State airport agency" means any department, commission, board, or official of a State government, which in the opinion of the Administrator has adequate powers and is suitably equipped and organized to satisfy the requirements of the Administrator for participation in the Federal-aid airport program herein authorized.

(q) "State funds" means any funds, other than Federal funds, which are available to a State airport agency or project sponsor for expenditure under this act, including any funds contributed to it by any other non-Federal public agency for use in matching the Federal funds made available for a particular project.

AIRPORT SERVICE

Sec. 3. The Federal-aid airport program authorized by this act shall be administered by the Administrator through an Airport Service which shall be responsible for carrying out all the functions of the Administrator relative to airports and landing areas under sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451, 452, 453, 456, and 457).

FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

Sec. 4. In order to bring about the establishment of a Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics and to promote the interests of national defense, the Administrator is hereby authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made therefor by the Congress, to make grants of funds to the States, their political subdivisions, and other non-Federal public agencies for the development of public airports as hereinafter provided in amounts not to exceed 50 per centum of the allowable project costs of each project, except as otherwise provided in section 9 of this act. Such Federal-aid airport program shall consist of two parts, hereinafter referred to as the "State program" and the "urban program." The State program shall include all projects for the development of class 3 and smaller airports and the urban program all projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports. In each program, the State airport agency or project sponsor receiving a grant may use to match such grant any State funds available for the purpose. For purposes of this act, a project shall be considered one for development of an airport of a certain class if upon completion of the airport development proposed, the airport so developed would be properly classifiable as of that class according to the airport classification standards of the Administrator stated in Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin "Airport Design" dated April 1, 1944.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 5. For the purposes of carrying out the Federal-aid airport program authorized by this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000,000 for the first post-war fiscal year, and \$100,000,000 for each of the 4 successive post-war fiscal years thereafter, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 5 percent shall be available to the Administrator for all necessary planning and research and for all necessary expenses incident to the administration of this act, including the objects specified in section 204 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 424): *Provided*, That each such appropriation shall specify the maximum amount thereof that may be expended for the development of class 4 and larger airports, in no event to exceed 35 percent of the total appropriations. There is also hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, immediately upon passage of this act, \$3,000,000 for preliminary planning and surveys preparatory to commencement of the program. The first post-war fiscal year shall be that fiscal year which ends on June 30 following the date proclaimed by the President as the termination of the existing war emergency, or following the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, or following the date on which the Congress by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses finds as a fact that the war emergency hereinbefore referred to has been relieved to an extent that will justify proceeding with the airport program provided for by this act, whichever date is the earliest.

NATIONAL AIRPORT PLAN

SEC. 6. The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to prepare, and revise annually, a national plan for the development of public airports, which plan shall specify, in terms of general location and type of development, all the airport projects considered necessary to provide a Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics and to promote the interests of national defense. In formulating and revising said plan, the Administrator shall take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying, the probable technological developments in the science of aeronautics, the likely growth and requirements of civil aeronautics, and such other considerations as he may deem appropriate, and shall consult, and take into consideration the views and recommendations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the several States, and their political subdivisions. The Administrator shall also consult, and consider the views and recommendations of, the War and Navy Departments as to the extent to which existing facilities constructed for national defense purposes may be made available in whole or in part for civilian use and as to what public airport development is needed for national defense, to the end that all such development included in the said plan and program may be as useful for national defense as is feasible. In carrying out this section, the Administrator is authorized to make such surveys, studies, examinations, and investigations as he may deem necessary.

SELECTION OF PROJECTS

SEC. 7. (a) Urban program: At least 2 months prior to the close of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a request for authority to undertake during the next fiscal year those of the projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports, included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by him under section 6 hereof, which, in his opinion, should be undertaken under the urban program during that fiscal year, together with an estimate of the Federal funds required to pay the share of the United States under this act on account of such projects. In determining which projects to include in such a request, the Administrator shall consider, among other things, the relative aeronautical need for and urgency of the projects included in the plan and the likelihood of securing satisfactory sponsorship of such project as required by the sponsorship requirements prescribed by him. In allocating and granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated for the carrying out of the urban program during the next fiscal year, the Administrator shall consider the appropriation as granting the authority requested unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress, and no such allocations or grants shall be made unless so authorized.

(b) State program: After deducting from the amount of each appropriation available for grants the amount thereof that may be granted for projects in the urban program, the remainder shall be available for the development of class 3 and smaller airports under the State program, as proposed in the then current revision of the national airport plan. All such funds shall be apportioned as prescribed in section 8 and shall be granted for the carrying out of projects selected and approved for operation as provided in section 9.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS

SEC. 8. (a) As soon as possible after the beginning of each fiscal year, all Federal funds available for the State program during that fiscal year shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the propor-

tion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. All sums so apportioned for a State shall be available to pay the United States pro rata share of the allowable project costs of authorized projects in that State, as provided in sections 9, 10, and 11.

(b) Upon making an apportionment or reapportionment, as provided herein, the Administrator shall certify to the Governor of each State, and to any public agency having requested such certification, the sums which he has so apportioned or reapportioned for projects within each State for the current fiscal year.

(c) All moneys apportioned hereunder shall be available as apportioned until the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the apportionment was made. Any apportioned amount which has not been granted at the end of the period during which it is available as apportioned under the terms of this section shall be reapportioned within 60 days thereafter, on the same basis as provided in subsection (a) of this section, among the States in which substantially all currently apportioned funds have been matched by the State or public agencies therein, and which have satisfied the Administrator prior to the close of the preceding fiscal year of their desire and ability to so match funds in excess of the annual apportionment. All sums so reapportioned shall be certified to the governors of the States, and to public agencies in the same way as if they were being apportioned under this act for the first time.

SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS

SEC. 9. (a) Any State airport agency representing a State which has complied with the provisions of this act and desires to avail itself of the benefits of the State program, and any public agency desiring to sponsor an authorized project in the urban program, or an authorized project in the State program if located in a State in which no State airport agency exists, may submit to the Administrator project applications in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator, setting forth the airport development proposed to be undertaken. Without exception, such projects shall include only such airport development as is included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by the Administrator under section 6 hereof, and all such proposed development shall be in accordance with standards established by the Administrator, which shall include standards for site selection, airport lay-out, grading, drainage, seeding, paving, and lighting. Each project application shall be accompanied by such plans, specifications, forms of contract, cost estimates, and other supporting materials as the Administrator may require.

(b) All such projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if the Administrator is satisfied that the project is designed to accomplish the purposes of this act, that sufficient funds are available therefor, that the project will be completed without undue delay, and that all sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this act have been or will be met. No project shall be approved by the Administrator with respect to any airport unless a State or a public agency holds good title, in form satisfactory to the Administrator, to the landing area of such airport or the site therefor, or gives assurance satisfactory to the Administrator that such title will be acquired. Unless and until a project is so approved either as originally proposed or as subsequently revised, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of any costs in connection with such project.

(c) If the Administrator approves any such project, he shall notify the State airport agency or project sponsor. The share of the United States, payable under this act on

account of any such project, shall not exceed 50 percent of the total estimated project costs thereof: *Provided*, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, such share payable to the State airport agency shall be increased by a percentage of the project cost equal to one-half the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of its total area.

GRANT AGREEMENTS

SEC. 10. Upon approving a project as provided in section 9, the Administrator shall transmit to the State airport agency, or project sponsor, as the case may be, an offer in behalf of the United States to pay 50 percent of the allowable project costs of said project, or such larger share as may be required by the provisions of section 9, on such terms, and subject to such conditions, as the Administrator may deem necessary to meet the requirements of this act and the regulations prescribed hereunder. Each such offer shall state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States and shall stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the State airport agency or project sponsor. If and when any such offer is accepted in writing by the State airport agency or project sponsor to which it is made, such offer and acceptance shall comprise a grant agreement constituting an obligation of the United States. Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed with respect to a project under this act, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the project costs which have been or may be incurred in carrying out that project.

ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of a project cost incurred in carrying out a project under either the State program or the urban program, unless the Administrator has first determined that said cost is allowable. A project cost shall be allowable under this act provided—

(a) It was incurred in accomplishing airport development in conformity with approved plans and specifications for an authorized project;

(b) It was incurred subsequent to the execution of a grant agreement with respect to the project in connection with which it was incurred, except that necessary costs of preparing a project, including those of field surveys and the preparation of plans and specifications, and the costs of acquiring property interests necessary for a project, may be allowable even though incurred prior to the execution of the grant agreement for such project, if incurred subsequent to the passage of this act; and

(c) It is reasonable in amount, in the opinion of the Administrator: *Provided*, That if the Administrator determines that a project cost is unreasonable in amount, the amount which he determines would have been reasonable shall be an allowable project cost under this act.

The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations with respect to the auditing of project costs and other matters which he may deem necessary to effectuate this section.

METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION; WAGES AND HOURS

SEC. 12. (a) The construction work and labor in each State shall be done in accordance with its laws, and under the direct supervision of the State airport agency or project sponsor as the case may be, subject to the inspection and approval of the Administrator and in accordance with the rules and regulations made by him pursuant to this act: *Provided*, That a State airport

agency or project sponsor may utilize the construction services of other public agencies qualified to perform or supervise the work, including other State agencies: *Provided further*, That all contracts pursuant to this act which involve labor shall contain provisions establishing minimum rates of wages to be predetermined by the State or project sponsor, which contractors shall pay to skilled and unskilled labor, and such minimum rates shall be stated in the invitation for bids and shall be included in proposals or bids for the work. Such rules and regulations shall require such cost and progress reporting by the State airport agency or project sponsor to the Administrator as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe.

(b) All contracts let for construction projects and all loans and grants pursuant to this act shall contain such provisions as are necessary to insure (1) that no convict labor shall be employed on any such project; (2) that (except in executive, administrative, and supervisory positions), so far as practicable and feasible, no individual directly employed on any such project shall be permitted to work more than 40 hours in any 1 week; (3) that in the employment of labor in connection with any such project (except in executive, administrative, and supervisory positions), preference shall be given, where they are qualified, first, to persons honorably discharged from the military service of the United States, as defined in section 101 (1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940, and then to citizens of the United States and aliens who have declared their intention of becoming citizens, who are bona fide residents of the State in which the work is to be performed: *Provided*, That these preferences shall apply only where such labor is available and qualified to perform the work to which the employment relates.

(c) The acquisition of articles, materials, and supplies, wholly or in part with funds appropriated pursuant to this act, shall be subject to the provisions of section 2, of title III of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1934; and all contracts let pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be subject to the provisions of section 3 of title III of such act.

(d) Any allocation, grant, or other distribution of funds for any project, pursuant to this act, shall contain stipulations which will provide for the application of title III of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1934, to the acquisition of articles, materials, and supplies for use in carrying out such project.

GRANT PAYMENTS

SEC. 13. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations governing the manner in which payments shall be made under grant agreements executed pursuant to section 10: *Provided*, That no advance payments shall be made, except that partial payments may be made as work progresses or project costs are incurred, in such amounts, and at such times, as the Administrator may deem advisable. All grant payments shall be made to such official, or officials, or depository, as may be designated by the State airport agency or project sponsor entitled to such grants, and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds.

ELIGIBILITY OF STATES

SEC. 14. (a) To be eligible for participation in the benefits of the State program, a State shall, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, satisfy the Administrator that it meets the following requirements for such participation:

(1) Its legislature shall have assented to the provisions of this act and to its acceptance of Federal airport aid on the terms and conditions prescribed by the Administrator hereunder: *Provided*, That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of such State convening after ap-

proval of this act, the assent of the Governor of the State shall be sufficient.

(2) The State shall have a State airport agency as defined herein.

(3) The State shall have adequate legislation to enable its political subdivisions to participate in the benefits of both the State program and the urban program, either by sponsoring projects therein or otherwise.

(4) The State shall have adequate legislation for the prevention and removal of airport hazards by airport zoning under the State police power and the acquisition of property or air rights or navigation easements therein.

(5) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure that all airports developed within the State under the State program will be operated and managed in the public interest without unjust discrimination in favor of or against any person or class of persons.

(6) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure the proper maintenance, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions, of all airports developed within the State under the State program.

(7) The State shall have taken adequate steps to insure the availability each year of the State funds required for the development and maintenance of all airports developed or to be developed within the State under the State program.

(b) The requirements of paragraphs (2) to (7), inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section shall be suspended during a period of 3 years from and after the date of approval of this act.

(c) Federal aid shall be extended under this act only to projects located in States which expend or obligate during any one year at least an amount of money equal to the State's revenue during that year from any taxes on aviation fuel as such, and any other special fees or taxes imposed on aircraft, aviation, or aeronautical facilities or operations, excepting income taxes and taxes on corporations as such, for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports, and administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the retirement of bonds for the payment of which such revenues have been pledged.

PROJECT SPONSORSHIP

SEC. 15. (a) As a condition precedent to his approval of an airport project under this act, the Administrator shall assure himself to the extent feasible, that—

(1) the airport will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms;

(2) the airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith will be suitably operated and maintained, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions;

(3) the aerial approaches of the airport will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, and lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards so far as existing legislation permits;

(4) all the facilities of the airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and take-off of aircraft will be available to the United States for unrestricted use by military and naval aircraft in common with other aircraft at all times without charge other than a charge sufficient to defray the cost of repairing damage done by such aircraft or, if the use by military and naval aircraft shall be substantial, a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities so used;

(5) the airport operator or owner will furnish the Government at a reasonable rent therefor such space in airport buildings as may be reasonably adequate for use by the Government in connection with any airport air traffic control, or weather reporting, and communications activities pertinent thereto

which the Government may wish to establish at the airport;

(6) all project accounts and records will be kept in accordance with a standard system of accounting prescribed by the Administrator;

(7) the airport operator or owner will submit to the Administrator such annual or special airport financial and operations reports as the Administrator may reasonably request; and

(8) the airport and all airport records will be available for inspection by any duly authorized agent of the Administrator upon reasonable request. To provide such assurance, the Administrator shall prescribe such project-sponsorship requirements as he may deem necessary, consistent with the terms of this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in such regulations shall be construed to require any State or State airport agency to acquire any airport owned by any other public agency, to assume control over the operation of any such airport, or to sponsor a project which any other public agency is desirous of sponsoring. Among other steps to insure compliance with such requirements, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with the States and other public agencies, on behalf of the United States, and such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR STATES AND PROJECT SPONSORS

SEC. 16. Whenever it is the opinion of the Administrator that any real or personal property or interest therein necessary in connection with a project under this act cannot be acquired by the State, or by the public agency sponsoring the project, without undue expense or delay, the Administrator may, at the request of such State or public agency, institute a proceeding for the condemnation of such property or interest therein in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain," approved February 26, 1931 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 40, secs. 258a to 258e, inclusive), the entire cost of which acquisition shall be borne by the State or project sponsor out of the combined Federal and non-Federal funds available for such project. When so acquired by the United States, such property or interest therein shall be conveyed to the State supplying funds for its acquisition or to the public agency sponsoring the project, as may be appropriate.

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

SEC. 17. (a) Whenever the Administrator determines that use of any lands owned or controlled by the United States is reasonably necessary for the development of an airport under this act, or for the operation of any public airport, he shall file with the head of the department or agency having control of such lands a request that such property interest therein as he may deem necessary be conveyed to the State airport agency of the State in which the lands are located or to the public agency sponsoring the project or owning or controlling the airport, as he may designate. Such property interest may consist of the title or any lesser estate or interest in property, including any leasehold estate or avigation or other easement or right-of-way.

(b) If within a period of 4 months after such filing the said department or agency head shall not have certified to the Administrator that the requested conveyance is contrary to the public interest or inconsistent with the needs of that department or agency, the said department or agency head is hereby authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, and without

any expense whatsoever to the United States, to perform any acts and to execute any instruments necessary to make the conveyance requested: *Provided*, That each such conveyance shall be made on the condition that the property interest conveyed shall automatically revert to the United States in the event that the lands in question are not developed, or cease to be used, for airport purposes.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR DAMAGE BY ARMY OR NAVY

SEC. 18. (a) The Administrator is authorized to reimburse States or public agencies for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of public airports substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, or both. The Administrator is authorized on behalf of the United States to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe pursuant to this section, any claim submitted by any State or public agency for reimbursement of the cost of necessary rehabilitation or repair of a public airport, under the control or management of such State or public agency, substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy, or both.

(b) Such amount as may be found to be due to any claimant under this section shall be certified by the Administrator to Congress for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor. Such certification shall include a brief statement of the character of each claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed. No claim shall be considered by the Administrator pursuant to this section unless notice of intention to file such claim has been presented to him within 30 days after the occurrence of the damage upon which the claim is based, except that in case of damage caused by operations of a military nature during time of war such notice may be filed within 60 days after termination of the war.

REPORTING TO CONGRESS

SEC. 19. On or before the first Monday in February of each year the Administrator shall make a report to the Congress on his operations under this act during the preceding fiscal year, which shall include detailed statements of the Federal-aid airport development accomplished, the status of each project undertaken, the allocation of appropriations, and itemized statement of expenditures and receipts, and his recommendations, if any, for new legislation amending or supplementing this act. The Administrator shall also make such special reports as the Congress may request.

FALSE STATEMENTS

SEC. 20. Any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or any officer, agent, or employee of any State or public agency, or any person, association, firm, or corporation who shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof, in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or estimates of construction costs for any project submitted to the Administrator for approval under the provisions of this act or shall knowingly make any false statement, false representation, or false report or claim for work or materials for any project approved by the Administrator under this act, or shall knowingly make any false statement or false representation in any report required to be made under this act, or any acts supplementary thereto, with the intent to defraud the United States shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not to exceed 5 years or by a fine of not to exceed \$10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

EXISTING AIRPORT PROGRAMS

SEC. 21. Nothing in this act shall affect the carrying out of the program for the develop-

ment of public landing areas necessary for national defense, authorized by the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, or the program for the development of civil landing areas, authorized by the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, which programs shall be additional to the Federal-aid airport program authorized herein.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 22. This act shall take effect on the date of its approval.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the pending bill, Senate bill 2, is perhaps the greatest airport bill ever considered by the legislative branch of this Government. The bill has been in committee for more than 3 months. It has had consideration as careful and as detailed as any bill I have ever had the honor to report.

For 2 months after the bill was introduced it was circulated widely among all organizations interested in aviation, who were thus given an opportunity to formulate their views. The bill then came on for hearings, which were held between March 13 and March 23 before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The hearings were very thorough and very complete. Thirty-four separate witnesses were heard. Among the viewpoints represented were those of all levels of government, airport users, airport operators, aircraft manufacturers, aviation insurance, veterans, general business, and the construction industry. The committee heard the Secretary of Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Administrator and several of his aids. Governor Maw, of Utah, presented the views of the Council of State Governments. Representatives of individual cities and of the United States Conference of Mayors were heard at length. A spokesman appeared to represent the Civil Aviation Joint Legislative Committee. Both scheduled and nonscheduled air carriers, as well as fixed-base operators, were heard. Private flyers were well represented. The committee heard from such men as Col. Roscoe Turner, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky; W. T. Piper, president of Piper Aircraft Corporation; E. E. Miller, of Boeing Aircraft Corporation; and Charles M. Upham, director of the American Road Builders' Association. The manager of the transportation and communication department of the United States Chamber of Commerce testified. Every organization desiring to be represented, and every witness wishing to be heard, was heard in full.

When the hearings were concluded the bill was referred to a special subcommittee of which the senior Senator from Nevada, myself, had the honor to be chairman.

During all the proceedings which I have discussed two bills were before the committee. One was Senate bill 34, which had been introduced by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the chairman of the committee. The other was Senate bill 2, which had been introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada, myself. These bills were

similar in many respects. On some points they differed. The special subcommittee to which the bills were referred went about its work methodically. The first thing it did was to prepare a comparative print of the two bills, section by section, as a basis for analyzing their differences. Every amendment proposed by any witness at the hearings was reduced to writing and printed at the appropriate place in the comparative print to which I have referred. The subcommittee then sat down and in a series of meetings considered separately every one of those amendments in relation to both of the bills under consideration, and made tentative decisions as to which amendments should be adopted. On the basis of those decisions a committee print of the bill was prepared. Then the Civil Aeronautics Administration was called in and asked to make suggestions as to specific language which it considered desirable from an administrative viewpoint. A number of amendments suggested by the Civil Aeronautics Administration at these conferences were incorporated in the bill, after which the bill was reported to the full committee.

The full committee went over the subcommittee bill section by section and added several additional amendments.

I have dwelt upon this procedure because I want the Senate to understand that this bill has been given the fullest possible consideration. Many aspects of this legislation are technical, and it was necessary that every provision of the bill should be given the kind of consideration which it, in fact, received.

For the convenience of the Senate, the result of all these labors has been reported by the committee as a single amendment in the nature of a substitute for the language proposed in the original bill.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the meeting of the full committee, at which final action on the bill was taken, was very well attended, and 14 votes were cast in favor of reporting the bill as amended.

I do not believe it is necessary to go into great detail concerning the provisions of the bill, since all Senators have had an opportunity to study it. I shall, of course, be happy to answer any questions which Senators may wish to ask.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator about the provision which deals with cities and States. As the Senator knows, in the Federal aid road bill there is a provision which deals only with States. The States allot funds in accordance with the direction of the State boards. I understand that a similar provision is included in the pending bill. Will the Senator from Nevada kindly explain it?

Mr. McCARRAN. During the course of my brief discussion I shall go into that subject, and at the end of my discussion I shall explain the matter further.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield, but as soon as I conclude my preliminary statement I shall be glad to explain further the bill, or answer questions which Senators may desire to ask.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Ever since the former President of the Senate, now the President of the United States, referred two certain bills to the Interstate Commerce Committee, a controversy has existed with reference to jurisdiction over aviation legislation. The chairman of the Commerce Committee made a motion that the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of those bills. I had been appointed chairman of the subcommittee for consideration of the bills. In the Interstate Commerce Committee we respected the motion of the Senator from North Carolina pending a determination of the question which should have been made by the Senate before now. However, the Senate was busy for a long period of time in the consideration of the Mexican treaty. I spoke to the chairman of the Commerce Committee several days ago, and asked that an early day be set for the consideration of his motion.

Mr. President, the pending bill was reported last Monday. I happened to be off the floor at the moment that unanimous consent was requested that the bill be taken up and made the unfinished business of the Senate. I have not had an opportunity to study the report. I know that other members of our subcommittee, as well as members of the whole committee who are interested in the matter, have not had an opportunity to study the bill. I personally feel that the Commerce Committee should have respected the jurisdictional question in the same way that the Interstate Commerce Committee respected it. I do not want it to be understood that by their holding hearings before the question was disposed of, that our committee is in any way waiving the question of jurisdiction. All of their hearings were held after the motion was made.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is not waiving jurisdiction because he has no jurisdiction to waive.

Mr. McFARLAND. We do have something to yield and I think that this proposed legislation is very important, and should go over until we have had an opportunity to study it. We have not had such opportunity, and I think the bill should go over until at least next week. That will give our committee time to make recommendations as to further consideration.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know what the Senator has in mind, and if he will only permit me to make the explanatory statement perhaps we can work his problems out here to some extent.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want to work the problems out on the floor today. I shall not, however, further interrupt the Senator at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the committee bill, as reported,

authorizes a Federal-aid airport program to construct approximately 3,000 new airports and to improve about 1,600 of the 3,000 airports which now exist, at a cost to the Federal Government of \$500,000,000 over a 5-year period. The Federal funds are to be matched by an equal amount of State and local money, making a total national expenditure for the airport program of \$1,000,000,000 over a 5-year period. The construction program would not begin until after the end of the war, unless the Congress should determine otherwise, but the bill would make immediately available the sum of \$3,000,000 for preliminary planning and surveys by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The present national airport plan of the Civil Aeronautics Administration has been the subject of some criticism. The bill now before the Senate sets up standards for revising and improving this plan, and the \$3,000,000 appropriation to which I have referred would make it possible to undertake this work immediately so that actual construction of airports could get under way as soon as the war is over.

The proposal for a national airport program recommends itself from many viewpoints. It will, of course, provide a great many jobs in the post-war period. It will also give civil aviation a real chance to expand rapidly after the war. I cannot stress too strongly the importance to this country of such expansion. Just as the construction of highways brought about development of our automobile industry, so construction of an adequate system of airports will foster development of our aviation industry. I am sure all Senators are familiar with the tremendous boost to our national economy which resulted from development and expansion of the automobile industry during the quarter century which followed the last war. This bill provides an opportunity to lay the ground work for a similar boost to our national economy through development of our aviation industry.

By enacting this proposed legislation we will make possible an expanded and healthy air-transportation business.

We will stimulate aircraft manufacturing and allied industries. There is no field today which offers wider opportunities for individual enterprise to returning servicemen than the many phases of aviation, including the selling and servicing of aircraft and aviation materials and supplies, the training of pilots, and the construction and operation of privately owned airports.

Adequate development of aviation in this country will give us improved transportation facilities. It will make available to a far larger portion of our population the advantages of air-mail service. It will bring the advantages of private flying within the reach of the general public.

At the same time this bill is in a sense a national defense measure. By insuring a healthy aircraft manufacturing industry it will create facilities which can be effectively turned to war production in case of need. By making possible a larger and more efficient air-transport system, it will help to solve the problems

of supply which are so large a part of military considerations. By stimulating the training of pilots and mechanics, it will help to produce the backlog of skilled men which we shall desperately need in case of war.

I should be less than frank if I failed to state to the Senate that the formulation of this proposed legislation has not been free from controversy. Numerous sections of this bill represent compromises between conflicting viewpoints. It is the belief of the committee that these are happy compromises, doing essential justice to both viewpoints.

The two major points of controversy with regard to this bill were, first, the question of whether the national airport program should be formulated at the State level or at the Federal level; and, second, whether Federal funds for the construction of airports should be channeled entirely through the States, or whether cities should, under certain circumstances, be permitted to deal directly with the Federal Government.

With respect to the first point, it was argued strongly by certain governors that each State should prepare and formulate its own airport plan, and that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should only approve the State plans and fit them together into a national program. Your committee rejected this view because it felt that the national interest requires a single integrated national plan for airport development. Many of the facts which must be considered in preparing such a plan are peculiarly within the knowledge of Federal agencies. Examples of such facts are questions affecting the need of airports for national defense, questions affecting the need of airports for cross-country air lines, and numerous other questions affecting the national interest. If was the view of the committee that this program should head up in some one place; and that the logical agency to control it is the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The committee did not feel it would be justified in recommending expenditure of such a large sum of Federal money on an airport program unless the program was controlled by a Federal agency.

With respect to the second major point of controversy, the committee was mindful of the desirability of dealing directly with the States as much as possible. However, in the case of airport construction, by far the largest share of all non-Federal money so far expended has been put up by cities and not by States. The committee was of the opinion that an airport program is more nearly comparable to a river and harbor improvement program than to a highway program. A highway runs through city and countryside alike. An airport, like a harbor, has a fixed location, almost always in connection with a city.

Entirely aside from the question of the merits of the controversy, the committee was mindful of the necessity of recommending a compromise which would not alienate either the States or the cities. Both States and cities have substantial political influence, and the committee tried to report a bill which could have

back of it the influence of both States and cities.

The bill now before the Senate separates the airport program into two sections. One includes the larger airports, designated as class 4 and class 5 airports, which are, broadly speaking, those airports with runways in excess of 4,700 feet in length. The other section of the program would include smaller airports, those known as class 1, 2, and 3 airports. The bill refers to the larger airports as the urban program, and to the smaller airports as the State program; but it should be borne in mind that there is really only one program, and that this division is only for purposes of setting up a dividing line as a basis for the compromise between the views of the States and the views of the municipalities.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In 1916, when we passed the Federal Aid Highway Act, only about half the States had State highway departments, so the law provided that temporary arrangements might be made, as best we could, to require definitely that within a reasonable period of years each State must have a State highway department or it would not get Federal aid. The way the matter is left in the pending bill, there is no time limit on making such an arrangement.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is a time limit of 3 years in which the State must conform.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is to say, that if a State creates a State aviation commission within 3 years, after that we will not deal directly with cities?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; that is not the case, but we will deal with a representative of the State, like the Governor, until such time as the legislature of each State shall have an opportunity to establish an airport authority.

Mr. HAYDEN. But there is no Federal statute, and there is nothing in the pending bill, which would require a State, as a condition precedent to obtaining Federal funds, to establish a State airport authority within a reasonable time?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; there is such provision in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the State itself wants to apply for money, it must have such an authority, but if the State does not desire to do so, then we go to the cities, and if the State never does so, it is all done by the cities?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a telegram from 11 western Governors who met in Reno, in the Senator's own State, which states the objection the Governors have, and I should like to read it. It is brief.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The telegram reads:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., May 2, 1945.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am informed by Governors' conference that airport bill, Senate 2, will be taken up on Thursday. The conference of western Governors in Reno recently unanimously approved a resolution urging that the same Federal-State pattern developed in Federal-

State Highway Act should be followed in airport bill. Do not believe Federal Government can deal successfully with counties and cities, eliminating States from participating in airport program. Urge that you do your utmost to pass legislation in this field similar to Federal-State Highway Act, which has been administered successfully over a period of years.

SIDNEY P. OSBORN, Governor.

The point I wish to make is that obviously the great majority of the States are not now equipped to function with State-aid authorities of any kind. Nor were they equipped at the time the Federal Highway Act was passed, in 1916, to do it. If Congress wishes to provide that pending such time we will deal with cities, but ultimately it is the desire that we deal with States, then there should be a time limit provided in the bill. The bill should provide that unless a State acts within a certain time it will not get the aid. If we had not made such provision in the Highways Act, many of the States, up to this time, would not have created highway commissions.

Mr. McCARRAN. I call the attention of the Senator to the "Eligibility of States," on page 45 of this bill, section 14 (a), as follows:

SEC. 14. (a) To be eligible for participation in the benefits of the State program, a State shall, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, satisfy the Administrator that it meets the following requirements for such participation:

(1) Its legislature shall have assented to the provisions of this act and to its acceptance of Federal airport aid on the terms and conditions prescribed by the Administrator hereunder: *Provided*, That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of such State convening after approval of this act, the assent of the Governor of the State shall be sufficient.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the way we handled the matter in the case of the Highway Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill continues:

(2) The State shall have a State airport agency as defined herein.

(3) The State shall have adequate legislation to enable its political subdivisions to participate in the benefits of both the State program and the urban program, either by sponsoring projects therein or otherwise.

In other words, we so provide that the State may participate in a city program, or a city may handle it by itself, if it wishes to do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand; but the bill does set up urban programs.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. It contemplates that, so far as the pending bill is concerned, or so far as any legislation is concerned, for all time to come there will be urban programs.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That we can by-pass the State.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The issue is whether or not that is a desirable thing to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; that is the issue, and that is what the Senate will have to determine.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we want to make it perfectly clear that we do not intend to by-pass the States, but only allow a reasonable period of time within which

States may qualify themselves to act, and that pending that we will handle the matter as provided in the pending bill, that would be a very different question.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not the question, and when the Senator makes a study of this subject, as I hope he will, he will discover it would never do to settle it in that way.

Let us take the city of New York, which has installed a \$51,000,000 airport, and is now contemplating a second airport, a \$72,000,000 airport. Is there any thought for a moment that the State of New York should have control over the La Guardia Airport? Certainly not. The city of New York should have control. It was erected by the city of New York, and why should not the city of New York have control? If the Federal Government participates in the installation of the other airport the city is to erect, why should the State of New York say, "You shall not have that airport, because you do not belong to the political party which we like," or for some other reason?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In my opinion, the Senator's concluding remark presents the danger of following the suggestion of the western Governors, namely, that the question will become involved in politics. Everyone knows that to be so; it is obvious. As the Senator has stated so well, the small cities and the large cities throughout the country are the ones which have taken care of the airport situation. In my State, in the Senator's State, and in the State of the Senator from Arizona, it was Phoenix and Tucson, it was Albuquerque, it was Reno, which attended to that matter, not the State governments at all. It will get into politics, in my opinion, if the State governments handle it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I believe it is the wish of all of us that there be provided throughout the United States a system of airways and airports which will accommodate the people. In order to do that, does not the Senator think that the States of the Union could better determine the localities where the money should be spent by the Government, rather than having one city in a State spending practically all the money in one city within its limits, perhaps the city of New York, or some other city, leaving out the rest of the State, and not having a system which would accommodate the people of the United States?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill is not subject to the criticism which the able Senator from South Carolina makes of it, because before drafting the bill we took into consideration the criticism he has just made, as well as the other criticism, and out of the two we moulded the pending bill, under which a State authority is to be set up, which will receive 65 percent of the Federal money to begin with. That money will be devoted to airports of classes 1, 2, and 3. The bill limits construction by urban program or city

program to airports of class 4 or larger. That is the very thought we had in mind. When the Senator expands on this thought a little he will find that the city of Charleston, S. C., may say: "We want an airport, and we are willing to bond ourselves to match the Federal Government dollar for dollar. The Federal Government will put up dollar for dollar if we will bond ourselves dollar for dollar for a \$5,000,000 airport." The State of South Carolina, if it had control, could say: "No; that airport cannot go there, we do not want it there, we want it at some other point." But the city of Charleston is willing and able to bond itself to put up the money to meet the appropriation of the Federal Government.

The bill does another thing. Before an urban program can go into effect, before the Civil Aeronautics Authority, under the bill, can settle on an airport of that kind at any place, it must submit the project and the estimated expenditure to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress will say whether or not the airport shall go where the Civil Aeronautics Authority has designated that it shall go.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the larger cities will have the better groups which can come before the bodies which will provide the money, so to speak, and the smaller cities will not have the men and the data the larger ones will have, and cannot advantageously present their proposals, and therefore the smaller places will be eliminated to a large extent?

Mr. McCARRAN. They will not be eliminated.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me finish my thought. If we had had the same plan in connection with our Federal highways and had let counties even come in and get the money from the Federal Government, what kind of a patchwork of roads would we now have in the United States? I think we are facing the very same problems in regard to aviation at the present time, and I hope we will not proceed in that direction and have a patchwork of aviation fields here and there, which will not be of benefit to the people of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry to say that the able Senator from South Carolina has obviously never read the bill or the report on the bill. His conjecture evidently must be based upon something someone has told him. I know there have been wild telegrams, such as the one just read from the western governors, in which my own Governor joined, messages from people who do not know what the bill provides.

The bill provides for the very thing the Senator asks, namely, that there shall be set up a State program, under State supervision, and the United States Government will match dollar for dollar, on request of the States, for all airports of classes 1, 2, and 3 which address themselves to the small places, of which the Senator speaks. The urban centers would have nothing whatever to do with that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But the bill sponsored by the Senator

from Nevada does give a city the right to come directly to the Federal Government instead of proceeding through the State government?

Mr. McCARRAN. For certain classes of airports, yes; such as class 4 and class 5, because the State would not build a class 4 airport or a class 5 airport except at a large city. There is where the airport would be built if built at all. The large city would say, "We will build that airport ourselves. We will put up the money for it. The State would not do it. So we will go to the Federal Government and will match dollar for dollar with the Federal Government."

Mr. President, let me dwell upon another point made mention of by the Senator from South Carolina. He likened this plan to the highway plan. Such a comparison cannot rightfully be made. The highways run from place to place through counties and through States. An airport is built for all time at a specific place; it does not run anywhere.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But it is necessary to go from a certain point to another given point by air.

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, yes; in the air; I know that.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill. I represent a State in which there probably is not, at the present moment, an airport which would be classified as class 4 or 5. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada about the time when the classification of an airport would be determined. That is to say, assuming the city of Burlington, Vt., should, after the passage of this bill, desire to construct an airport, having runways of more than 4,000 feet, if it should make an application for Federal aid on a specification for an airport having runways of 5,000 feet, would the city of Burlington thereupon become eligible to enter into this relation with the Federal Government which is called the urban plan?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. This would be the procedure: The city of Burlington would make its own preliminary study and survey, and would then take the matter up with the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The Civil Aeronautics Authority, pursuant to the request, would make a study, and the two parties would come together on a plan for that particular airport. If it were to be a class 4 airport well and good, they would agree on it. It would take its classification number largely from the length of its runways. The city of Burlington could come directly to the Federal Government and ask to match dollar for dollar for the construction of that airport, or it could go to its State authority created by the Legislature or by other State arrangement and say, "Will you as a State organization join in our request that the Federal Government match dollar for dollar for the building of this airport—Class 5 airport, if you please—at Burlington." The State could take it up, go forward with it, by the direction and under the supervision of the C. A. A., and come to the Congress of the United

States and receive a dollar-for-dollar contribution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the State should elect to do that, thereupon would the municipality step out of the position of Federal cooperation, and would the State become the director of the development?

Mr. McCARRAN. The State of Vermont and the city of Burlington could join, and they would be joined in the construction of the airport all the way through.

That gives rise to another question which I think the Senator could with propriety ask, and that is: Who would have control over the airport after it was constructed? That again is a matter for the municipality and the State finally to settle, and it would be settled between the municipality, the State and the Civil Aeronautics Authority. But before the airport would have the approbation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, either the State of Vermont, or the city of Burlington, or some other authority would have to enter into an agreement and arrangement whereby it would be responsible for the maintenance of the airport after its construction.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming there is in existence at Burlington an airport with less than the length of runway necessary to make it a class 4 or a class 5 port, would the policies already described by the distinguished Senator apply in the case of an application by such a municipality to increase the length of the runway?

Mr. McCARRAN. It would.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under this bill, States and State agencies would be permitted to sponsor any size airport project, whether in the State program or in the urban program. Cities would be allowed to sponsor projects only in the urban program, except in the case of States which do not have State airport agencies. In such a State, cities would be permitted to sponsor projects in the State program until such time as the State created an agency through which it could act.

I may point out to the Senate that the present national airport plan, that is the plan which the Civil Aeronautics Authority has at the present time, includes only 316 airports of class 4 and above, whereas approximately 5,700 airports of class 3 and smaller are included.

Let me repeat that so that the Senate may understand it. I point out that the present airport plan of the Civil Aeronautics Authority includes only 316 airports of class 4 and above, whereas approximately 5,700 airports of class 3 and smaller are included.

I emphasize this, and I depart from my prepared remarks to emphasize it to show that what the western Governors are clamoring for and what some Senators believe in is the very thing we have sought to work out in the bill, which is

that the States could sponsor by far the larger program.

The figures are 5,000 as against 300. Five thousand airports could be sponsored by the respective States, for which the States themselves would select the sites, and the Civil Aeronautics Authority would go along with that plan; as against 300 airports which might be created by municipalities here and there.

The bill provides—and I draw this especially to the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]—that not more than 35 percent of the total annual appropriation may be allocated to the larger airports which make up the urban program. The percentage may be smaller. Under this bill money could not be expended for a major airport project until the project had been approved by the Congress and funds earmarked for it.

The reason for that, Mr. President, is that in dealing with \$50,000,000 airports, such as the airport in the city of New York, known as the LaGuardia Field, in dealing with a \$72,000,000 airport which it is proposed to construct in the near future, and in dealing generally with airports which would be constructed at cities of large population, and which would run into large sums of money, we believe the safe thing to do is to come to the Congress of the United States and through the Civil Aeronautics Authority set up the program, and let the Congress pass on whether or not such large sums of money should be expended at certain places.

Mr. President, the procedure to be followed would be similar to the procedure which we follow in the case of river-and-harbor projects. In preparing his annual appropriation estimate, the Civil Aeronautics Administrator would include estimates for those major airport projects which he felt might be undertaken during the year ahead, and he would furnish the Congress with enough detail concerning those projects to enable congressional determination as to whether they should be approved. The committee believes this is a wise provision. The larger airports will be the ones on which money will be spent in big chunks. It is entirely proper that the Congress should have the right to review such projects before authorizing such large expenditures.

Aside from the two points I have mentioned, controversy over other points in the bill was not sharp.

The bill contains a provision requiring States to expend for aviation development amounts at least equal to any sums collected from taxes on aviation fuel or other special fees or taxes imposed on aircraft, aviation, or aeronautical facilities or operations. This follows the precedent set in the highway acts.

The bill contains a provision permitting use of the Federal power to condemn land in the acquisition of land for airport purposes, but it provides that this power may be used only upon the specific request of the project sponsor.

In other words, if a community is unable to purchase land, if it is unable to acquire a site, then it may say to the Federal Government, "We request that you acquire this site," and then condemnation may be resorted to; but only

on the request of the State or the municipality.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to inquire of the Senator what was the reason for changing in this bill the proverbial legal pattern of condemnation?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is done because we do not want the Federal Government to be condemning promiscuously, and we do not want the Federal Government to be exercising the right of eminent domain in a community without the immediate request of the community itself. In other words, if a community could ordinarily acquire the site by resorting to the laws of its own State and its own vicinity, we would want the community to exhaust all possible resources before it called upon the Federal Government to proceed under the right of eminent domain.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. After reading the bill, I understand it would give the Administrator absolute power, if he stepped into the picture, to take possession of a man's property without proceeding according to the regular court process, and it would permit him to prove his ground for doing so afterward. It seems to me that in that respect the cart is placed before the horse.

Mr. McCARRAN. Today in nearly every State of the Union, and under the present Federal law, that is the procedure. Some few years ago we enacted such a measure. In other words, in very many States—I am not certain about the condition in the Senator's own State—such proceedings in eminent domain may be instituted, although, of course, they must be for a public purpose.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a further interruption?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Was that procedure instituted in view of the urgent necessities arising because of the war, and for the reason that during the war we could not stop to file lawsuits?

Mr. McCARRAN. No. The act the Senator now has in mind is a very recent one. But previously there was an act providing for the acquisition of land for highway purposes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But the matter had to be handled through the courts, I assume.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon; the highway authorities could take possession immediately, and subsequently the court procedure would follow.

Mr. President, the bill provides a method for reimbursement for damage to public airports resulting from use by the Army or Navy. That is a matter which has been very controversial for the past several months.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I can think of one airport in particular where that is a very sore subject—namely, the proportion of the rental the Federal Government shall

pay to the airport, because the Government fixes the amount it will pay for weather service, office rent, and other facilities at the airport. If all an airport could collect or if all a city or State could collect were merely payment for the damage done to the runways, that would be only a small part of the damage or the rental use of the property.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine the provisions of the bill in that respect he will find that we have gone much further than that. We have made the Civil Aeronautics Authority in part, and in good part, the arbiter to say what has been the extent of the damage.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator refer to the damage done to the runways?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But there is also a rental issue.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator refer to rental for the buildings?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes. If planes come to the airport, necessarily they must have the use of the ticket office there and telephone service and radio service and all the other facilities which go with an airport. Are we not going to provide for some compensation for the use of those airport facilities?

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me read to the Senator a provision of the bill which I think has a bearing on that point, and we shall see whether it meets the question raised by the Senator. I read from page 47 of the bill:

(4) all the facilities of the airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and take-off of aircraft will be available to the United States for unrestricted use by military and naval aircraft in common with other aircraft at all times without charge other than a charge sufficient to defray the cost of repairing damage done by such aircraft or, if the use by military and naval aircraft shall be substantial, a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities so used.

I think that touches, at least in part, the point the Senator has in mind.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is the provision the Senator has read in Senate bill 2?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am unable to find it in the copy of the bill I have. I will have to get another copy.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is on page 47.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the bill sets up a method for reimbursement for damage to public airports resulting from use by the Army or Navy. Such a provision is long overdue. It was the view of the committee that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is in the best possible position to appraise the extent of such damage. The bill does not provide for actual payment; but it only provides that, upon proper claim made, the Civil Aeronautics Administrator shall appraise the damage and shall report to Congress the amount of reimbursement to which the claimant is entitled. It would then be up to the Congress in its discretion to approve a specific appropriation for the purpose.

That statement covers the major provisions of the bill and its legislative history down to the present time. This is important legislation, for which there is an urgent need. Enactment of this legislation should not be delayed. The end of the war is drawing closer day by day, and the national interests of the country require that this program shall be ready to go into effect immediately upon the achievement of final victory.

Mr. President, let me say, in conclusion, that I am advised by the Senator from Ohio and other Senators that there is a desire on the part of some Senators, who now are absent on official business, to participate in the discussion and to be present at the time of the passage of the bill. I regret exceedingly that it may be necessary to delay consideration of the bill; but no more important piece of legislation has been before the Senate for a long time. It is important, in that it entails the expenditure for airport purposes of approximately \$1,000,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States. It is important because it sets up a program for the construction of airports throughout the length and breadth of our country. It is important because, although, by and large, many men study aviation and are interested in it, they do not have time to give their personal study or consideration to matters as technical as those which are involved in formulating a program of this kind.

There is no desire on the part of the Committee on Commerce to push for action on the bill beyond what would be proper in connection with having it receive full consideration.

While this work has been for me a labor which has extended over the years, there is no desire on my part to have the bill go through under such circumstances that any Member of the Senate might say, "I wish I had known that that or this was in the bill; I did not understand it when I voted for it." I wish to have every Senator understand the bill and have an opportunity to consider it fully before it comes to a final vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I share the very great interest of the Senator from Nevada in the development of our air facilities. I feel that it would be unfortunate if the suggestion at this time of the expenditure of a billion dollars of public funds upon what will seem to many persons to be a new phase of activity for the Federal Government, should seem to be in conflict with the over-all objective which was so splendidly emphasized yesterday by the President in the suggestion of a cut in many of our appropriations, looking today the day when we can return to financial solvency.

In the support which some of us, at least, have given to legislation of this character, I should want it to be made clear that this is an authorization bill. I invite comment of the Senator from Nevada on the question of whether or not ultimately, when the appropriation comes before us, in accordance with the regular practice, it must be related to our general financial problem. I believe that no phase of our public-works pro-

gram could be more helpful or significant than this one, in respect both to furnishing work and developing our air facilities. However, the fact that we may, as I hope we will, authorize work of this character to be done should not be construed as indicating that we are embarking upon a financial debauch. I believe that the Appropriations Committee which must finally make the funds available will take into account not only the necessities of the case, but our whole general economic picture, in determining whether or not at any given time the necessary funds shall be made available.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very grateful to the Senator from Maine for his comment, and I join with him in asserting that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, I rejoiced in the message which was sent to the Congress a few days ago by the President in which he recommended the curtailment of public expenditures to the extent of approximately seven and a half billion dollars. When the war is over we must attempt to curtail the expenditure of public funds. However, it must be done wisely; we must curtail with prudence. We must also remember that during the period shortly following the end of the war hundreds of thousands of people will be out of employment. Many of them will be in communities which will seem strange to them. Many of them will be seeking employment.

Among the reasons why I am in favor of the pending bill is that our late beloved President cited in one of his last messages the necessity of providing for the construction of airports. I think the day is near when we must realize that the war is about to come to an end, and that those who are returning from the war effort, whether in civilian or in military life, must find places of employment. I seek to have this bill considered by the Senate as a means by which there may be afforded to thousands of people an opportunity to find employment. The bill will also afford an opportunity to establish a great program of expansion in the aviation industry.

Mr. President, if we in this country ever hope to pay off our public indebtedness, in excess of \$300,000,000,000—and certainly all patriotic members of society hope to pay it off—our country will have to launch one of the greatest programs of commercial activity of which any country has ever known. If that program is launched, we must speedily find a means by which our products will have access to the markets of the world. We must resort to the speediest methods available. Aviation gives promise of making it possible that a commodity produced today, for example, in the heart of America may be transported through the air to the heart of Europe by tomorrow evening.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to express my appreciation of the Senator's attitude regarding the postponement of the pending bill. There are Senators on this side of the Chamber who wish to be heard. I refer particularly to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and

the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I agree with the Senator as to the importance of the bill, and I assure him that upon his return we will cooperate in every way possible to obtain a prompt and satisfactory consideration of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very grateful to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. With respect to what has been said about financing Federal programs, I hope that before too long the aeronautical program will be established on its own bottom, and that it will finance itself, just as the Federal highway program now finances itself. I hope that the program will take care of its own financial needs through funds raised within the industry itself.

However, Mr. President, that is not the purpose for which I rose. On April 16, I submitted an amendment to section 9 of Senate bill 2, and had it referred to the commerce committee for consideration. I found that the committee, in its wisdom, did not act favorably upon my amendment, and I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada whether the amendment was given any consideration by the committee.

The bill itself would not become effective until during the postwar period. However, some of the cities in Colorado, as well as in other States, floated bond issues to build and improve airports. It seems to me that cities which found it necessary to undertake such projects—of course, it had to be found that they were in the interests of the war effort—and expect to expend revenues from their bond issues, should be given credit for whatever money they expend along that line after a certain date. The date which I included in my amendment was January 1, 1945. It seems to me that credit should be given to any city or State which has spent or will expend any of its funds in connection with airport construction after January 1, 1945.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that I voluntarily brought the Senator's amendment to the attention of the full committee. My recollection is that there were approximately 12 or 14 members present in the committee. I did not urge the amendment of the Senator; but I did bring it to the attention of the committee. The committee did not think well of it in the form in which it was presented. I believe, however, there is some merit in the thought expressed in the Senator's amendment. But it must be boiled down and put into such language as will address itself to a limited situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with the Senator from Nevada on that point. We did not want to open the door wide. My amendment was drawn by the Legislative Counsel. After it was submitted to me and I had examined it, the language of the amendment appeared to be awkward, and difficult to some extent. Therefore, I can well understand that the committee, if it gave to the amendment only casual observation, did not find it in very good form. I am not responsible for its form, because

I had to leave the drawing of the amendment to the technicians.

Mr. McCARRAN. The technicians put too many technicalities in it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thought they worded it rather strangely. However, Mr. President, I am not particularly interested in that phase of the matter, nor do I consider myself an expert on legal language. I wish merely to provide that any communities which have, since January 1, 1945, spent sums of money, through bond issues or otherwise, in improving their airports, may be allowed some credit for the work which they have done, providing the work measures up to acceptable standards, and has the approval of the administrator of the proposed act. Before the pending bill shall have been enacted I hope that an amendment along the line to which I have referred may be written into the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sympathetic with the thought expressed by the Senator from Colorado, providing it can be worked out. I shall be glad to confer with the Senator on the subject.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude on the pending bill by making a brief further statement pertaining to it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the Senator is willing that the consideration of the pending bill be postponed?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; that is what I am about to request.

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to express my appreciation of the Senator's action because otherwise, as a member of the committee I should feel obliged to make the appropriate motion.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have made this explanatory statement on the floor of the Senate today in the hope that I might arouse interest in this bill so that at a later day when it comes before the Senate for more meticulous consideration and for final passage all Senators may have had the opportunity of studying it. It is not a subject that one can pick up and grasp in a moment. It is a subject that has taken years in the case of some of us, and it will take a little time for Senators fully to understand it. I do not propose to urge on the floor a bill that Senators do not understand, and, in view of the fact there are Senators absent from the Chamber on official business, I gladly ask that the bill may be laid aside, to be taken up at a later date on my return.

That brings me to this point, Mr. President. I am required to leave the city of Washington and to go west on official business, leaving here tomorrow at 5:30 p. m. I ask permission of the Senate that I may be excused for 3 weeks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada that he may be excused for 3 weeks? The Chair hears none and the Senator from Nevada is excused.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment; I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question. Did he say 2 weeks or 3 weeks?

Mr. McCARRAN. I said about 3 weeks, but I do not want to be tied down to 3 weeks. I do not want to be called absent, if I am not here on a given day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair understand the parliamentary situation. Is the bill in charge of the Senator from Nevada to go over?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. I request that the bill go over for further study, and presentation and consideration on my return at a later date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then, it is not to be the unfinished business for the next 3 weeks?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not to be the unfinished business until my return.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And the calendar will be open.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have two telegrams from Mr. L. L. Schroeder, commissioner, Minnesota Department of Aeronautics, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record following the remarks of the Senator who now has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegrams are as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 3, 1945.
Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

With reference to the McCarran airport aid bill, S. 2, your attention is called to the progressive aviation legislation enacted by the Minnesota Legislature in anticipation of coordinating it with a national-airport program. At the same time the legislature unanimously passed a joint resolution dealing with matters of policy which resolution was forwarded to you. That resolution would question the following specific points in S. 2, the McCarran bill.

1. The State should not be excluded from its natural rights and community of interest in airport planning and development as is proposed under the so-called dual program which provides for by-passing the State under the urban phase of the program. See section 4.

2. The States and the municipalities will pay at least half and in most cases more of the original cost, and in addition must pay the cost of maintenance indefinitely, which does not justify the argument offered to sustain the limitations of sections 14 and 15. These sections give unlimited control over the airports after construction to the Federal administrator, whereas the burden of cost and responsibility remains with the State and the municipality.

3. The requirement in section 15 that as an additional price for Federal aid the municipality must provide free office space indefinitely to the Federal airport agencies is unjust.

4. The standards as to the kind and size of airport which will be required by the administrator and which will have the effect of forcing a municipality to enter into a contract for an unlimited period of time, the terms of which are unknown.

5. The national planning provisions of section 6 have already been demonstrated to be

inadequate and must of necessity give greater force to local and State planning needs and economic ability.

6. The requirement that the States must ultimately give legislative consent to the provisions of S. 2 in order to participate becomes a loaded pistol to force States which have been enticed into accepting aid to condone a program of forced spending.

While this bill appears to be very close to the form of Federal airport aid program which is needed and supported by the vast majority of Minnesota people, it is hoped that such minor amendments as may be necessary can be made to ensure that the program will adhere to the principles of municipal, State, Federal, intergovernmental co-operation, following the patterns of highway development which has been so successful. Pages 46, 47, 54, 56, and 59 of the testimony at the hearings before the Senate subcommittee in March, strongly indicate that the Federal-municipal type of program has resulted in poor planning, a waste of public funds, and does not justify the contention that therefore the same course should now be more ardently pursued. Minnesota has recognized its responsibility in the aviation program just enacted, and there is reason to believe that other States will take similar action when it may be necessary. Your support of the Federal aid program is urged, modified insofar as it may be possible, to meet the suggestions made herewith.

L. L. SCHROEDER,
Commissioner of Aeronautics.

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 3, 1945.

Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
United States Senate:

Supplementing my telegram, there should be provision in the airport bill which will permit municipalities to receive credit for funds expended by the municipality in advance of Federal appropriation, so long as these funds are expended in the development of an airport, the master plan of which has been approved by C. A. A. The effect of this position will be to stimulate some local initiative.

L. L. SCHROEDER,
Commissioner,
Minnesota Department of Aeronautics.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate bill 2, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Wyoming will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2, to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, be restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF ROBERT E. HANNAGAN
TO BE POSTMASTER GENERAL

During the delivery of Mr. McCARRAN's speech,

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield further to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I report favorably the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator again state his request?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have reported the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General, and, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit, the Chair will have the nomination stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the nomination has been reported, and, as in executive session, I am asking unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

I wish to say that Mr. Frank C. Walker, the present Postmaster General, has been a splendid official and has made a brilliant record. He is one of the nicest men I ever knew. As all Senators know, the Post Office Department under his direction has been very successful, and has made large profits during the last 2 or 3 years. That fact is gratifying in the extreme, and I want to say that, in my judgment, Mr. Walker has proved himself to be one of the best officials of the Government. He has been faithful, trustworthy, intelligent, and able in the handling of the affairs of the Department, and it is with regret that I read that he had offered his resignation.

Mr. Robert E. Hannegan, who is well known to the public, is a man of fine ability, of the highest character and standing, and I believe that he, too, will make a most excellent Postmaster General. For that reason I am asking the Senate as in executive session to give immediate consideration to his nomination.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suppose under the rule this nomination would go over?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would go over.

Mr. WHITE. So far as I personally am concerned I have no possible reason for objecting to the immediate consideration of this nomination, but I have heard some discussion of the matter and I am going to ask the Senator if he will not withhold his request until later in the afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course I will; I will have to do it.

Mr. WHITE. I do not want to object, but if the Senator will allow me I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps I can help the Senator out a little in regard to the objections which have been made. My

distinguished friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] said at first that he wanted the nomination to go over; but as I understand, he is now willing that it be immediately considered, though he wants to make some observations regarding it. I am going to yield the floor to him as soon as the Senator from Maine has finished so that he may say what he desires to say about it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I merely want to be sure that I shall have an opportunity to talk with one or two Senators on the floor, and that no action will be taken on the nomination in the meantime.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator insists I will withdraw the request and will be willing to have it go over until he makes such examination as he considers fit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be placed on the executive calendar.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1945

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, House Joint Resolution 174, making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are two appropriations. One is for the Panama Canal construction annuity fund for 1945, of \$315,480. The estimate last year was \$1,500,000 for these annuities, which must be paid; there is no way in the world to avoid their payment. Therefore, it is necessary that this amount be appropriated.

The other appropriation is made necessary by a lack of funds for St. Elizabeth's Hospital, a most worthy institution, which has incurred obligations which it will be necessary to pay.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the joint resolution which has already been passed by the House of Representatives be passed by the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the minority members of the Appropriations Committee have considered the joint resolution, have no objection to its present consideration, and fully approve immediate action on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much; I appreciate his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendments to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution?

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSPECTION AND SUPERVISION BY CONGRESS OF ADMINISTRATION OF LAWS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and request that it be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 958) to provide for more effective inspection and supervision by the Congress with respect to the administration of the laws of the United States was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is a bill to provide for more effective inspection and supervision by the Congress with respect to the administration of the laws of the United States. The bill would create a joint committee of the House and Senate, as a regular committee of the two bodies, vested with the authority to make investigations with respect to the practices, the procedure, and the expenditure of funds in executive departments or administrative agencies of the Government. The committee would be composed of seven Members of each body, four from the majority party of the Senate, three from the minority, and a like number from the House from each party.

Mr. President, the real objectives of the measure are stated in section 2, which I shall read:

The committee is authorized and empowered to conduct investigations and studies into the practices, procedures, administrative processes, and efficiency of any department or agency of the Government (including any corporation owned by the Government). The committee shall receive and consider complaints relating to the practices, procedures, administrative processes, and efficiency of any such department or agency. It shall be the duty of the committee, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, to make such investigations and studies under this subsection as in its judgment may be necessary to keep the Congress fully informed as to whether or not the laws of the United States are being properly and efficiently administered and as to whether or not additional legislation is necessary and appropriate to improve their administration.

Mr. President, the bill further provides that this committee, which would be a regular standing committee, should make a report annually to the Congress on the 15th day of January with respect to its work, and any recommendations it felt appropriate. It would also be permitted to make reports to the Congress at any time when in its judgment a report should be made.

I know we are considering, and there is a great clamor for, a streamlining of Congress, a reorganization of the Congress in order to enable it to function more efficiently and more smoothly, and it may appear that we already have too many committees, and that there should be a consolidation of the committees we now have rather than the creation of new committees.

My thought is that if this bill shall be enacted, it will establish a joint committee of the two Houses, a permanent committee, which will obviate the necessity of creating a special committee every time something arises which the Congress feels should be investigated by the Congress or by either branch of it. It will also prevent a duplication of hearings and investigations by the two Houses. We often have hearings and investigations being conducted simultaneously by a special committee of the Senate and by some committee of the House, and there is a duplication of effort. I think there is great waste of time by reason of that situation. If we establish a joint committee like that proposed by this bill, which will be authorized to conduct investigations whenever occasion arises, whenever the complaints we receive justify it, or whenever in the opinion of the committee, in its diligence in exercising its own power, it concludes that an investigation should be made, it then would be empowered to make the investigation and would be constituted for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought perhaps a little information as to the number of committees now investigating different subjects before the Congress might add a little to the Senator's statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should be glad to have the Senator suggest the number.

Mr. LUCAS. I should just like to tell the Senator and the Senate that today there are 50 investigating committees, in the House and the Senate, investigating every conceivable thing they can think about in connection with Government. Certainly there is duplication of effort. As the Senator said a moment ago, the very thing a committee of the Senate is investigating a House committee may be investigating, and one of the most current illustrations of that is the investigation of the O. P. A. The House committee investigated it thoroughly, and took weeks to do so. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been investigating it for weeks. A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate is now working on its report and its findings, which it will report to the full committee, and when that has been done, the full committee will lay the report before the President of the United States.

Much valuable time is consumed in putting on the stand one witness after another from the executive departments and examining him. These men are on the merry-go-round all the time. We constantly hear complaints about the duplication of effort among Government departments. We hear complaints about the number of bureaus and statements are made that many of them could be merged into one agency which could take care of the situation better than five or six. Yet the Congress of the United States gives to the country one of the finest examples of duplication of effort about which I know anything. I think

the Senator from Arkansas really has something in his bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I might say to him, Mr. President, that if I thought the bill would simply create one more committee, without contributing to the elimination of other committees, I certainly would not introduce it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I share the views expressed by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. I think that in presenting his bill to the Senate the Senator from Arkansas is taking a very thoughtful and constructive step. I have particularly in mind a very fine, and I think we would now say, an indispensable service rendered to the Congress and to the country by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. I do not know what Congress would have done in more recent years if it were not for the joint committee which has had a staff of experts and which has been continuously studying the many questions of finance and of taxation.

Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator from Arkansas is certainly proceeding in a very statesmanlike manner in presenting this measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, if the bill is passed and the committee proposed by it is established it will result in serving the purpose of economy. We all know that of necessity any committee, in order to conduct effectively and thoroughly an investigation of any department of Government or most any other issue which the Congress needs to consider, must set up a staff of men who are capable of making investigations and doing research work, and all that costs the taxpayers money. If we could establish a joint committee of the two Houses, to which all these matters could be referred, and have such a committee properly staffed, then as these matters arise in connection with which Congress feels that something should be investigated, which could be requested by simple resolution adopted and referred to the committee, we would have already the machinery set up, and trained personnel ready to aid us in conducting such investigation.

Mr. President, I do not have in mind and am not trying to single out any agency of government. There are constant complaints being made, many of which are unjustified, many of which are unfounded, as we know. Some, however, are justified and have real merit in them. There is constant need, in view of the great expanse of Government operations and the tremendous powers granted to agencies and bureaus—and most of them I will say were granted of necessity—that the Congress have a joint committee to keep its hands on and keep control of, so to speak, and to keep informed respecting how the agencies of government are functioning.

When agencies place interpretations on the laws passed by Congress contrary to the intent of Congress, or when they engage in any practices which are not in

accord with the will of Congress under the laws we have passed, or when agencies are careless with respect to expenditures, or most any other function they perform, we will have a committee standing guard, Mr. President. If the occasion arises, if the need occurs for legislative supervision or investigation, then this committee will be ready and able to function.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I call the attention of the Senator to this very important fact: I know of committees representing, respectively, the House and the Senate of the United States investigating the same subject matter which have arrived at different conclusions as to what should be done with respect to what they were investigating. If a committee of the House of Representatives reaches one conclusion upon an important subject and a committee of the Senate reaches a conclusion which is diametrically opposed to that reached by the House, obviously both investigations will mean nothing so far as the public is concerned, or so far as any legislation is concerned.

In other words, a joint effort of the two Houses in reaching some sort of conclusion, whether it is good or bad, it seems to me, would add a considerable amount of dignity and weight to the finding respecting the subject being investigated, and the Congress as a whole, or any committee looking into the matter, could be satisfied that something worth while came out of the investigation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois. Under such circumstances there would be occasions. I am sure, when, if two committees were working together, there would probably be no difference of opinion. Each one would gain the same information, and would be conducting an investigation under circumstances where they were working together instead of working to separate purposes.

Mr. President, I think a committee of the nature I suggest will make some contribution to the efficiency of Congress, and I believe it will have a wholesome effect and influence upon the administrative agencies of the Government.

Mr. President, I find that I need to be in my own State next week to attend a flood-control meeting. I regard it as official business, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused for the first three or four days of next week in order that I may attend the meeting, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none and the Senator is excused.

ACCIDENTS IN THE AIR

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week when I was speaking about airplane accidents, I was interrupted by the acting majority leader who wished to have the Senate take a recess at that time, for a very good reason. At this time I wish to conclude reading a speech made over the radio in October 1943 by Senator Truman, now the President of the United States. His speech dealt with the Curtiss-Wright Co.

Mr. President, I may add that these airplane accidents have not stopped. As a matter of fact, only last week another training plane went down, at Sweetwater, Tex., with a loss of over 20 lives. The record still is that 17,500 pilots have lost their lives while in training, as compared with the 5,000 United States pilots who have died in all the theaters of war.

At this time I continue to read the speech made in October 1943 by Senator Truman, now our President. He said:

By and large the committee's efforts—

In other words, the Truman committee's efforts—

have received such support. The press and the radio deserve a great deal of credit for this, because the companies which had to be corrected include several of the largest corporations in the United States of America. They spend millions of dollars for advertising, which the press and radio risk if they publicize their mistakes.

These corporations also employ staffs of publicity men, who occupy themselves in attempts to confuse the issues and obtain public comment favorable to the companies based on a misunderstanding by the press or radio of the underlying facts.

A few of our better-known newspapers and one popular radio columnist have misunderstood the situation and by their reports to the public have unwittingly assisted in creating a false impression.

For example, the committee found that the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, the principal subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, was producing steel plate for the Navy and the Maritime Commission and Lend-Lease in its Irvin Works, and that the physical tests to which the finished steel plates were subjected to determine their tensile strength were faked and falsified. The company men in charge of the testing machines testified that about 5 percent or more of the tests were deliberately faked for the purpose of falsely reporting that the steel plate was in accordance with specifications. To do this they instructed the testers under them to cheat.

Needless to say, Mr. President, undoubtedly scores of fine Americans have lost their lives when serving as pilots because those testers cheated.

I continue to read the speech:

Shortly afterward, the committee found that the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, a subsidiary of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation, was guilty of selling for installation in Army and Navy planes airplane engines that were not in accordance with specifications.

The engines in question were made at Lockland, Ohio, near Cincinnati, in a plant designed by Curtiss-Wright, but built by the Government at a cost of more than \$140,000,000.

I want to tell you just how this investigation started and was conducted. In order to make sure that the engines being produced could properly be used in our military aircraft, both Curtiss-Wright and the Government employed many inspectors, at a total of several million dollars a year. The committee received letters from a number of these inspectors, particularly the Government inspectors, complaining that they were being forced to pass parts and engines which were not in accordance with the specifications. Now, these specifications were prepared by Curtiss-Wright itself, and were approved by the War Department.

Curtiss-Wright never has claimed that the specifications were needlessly made too strict.

LOOKED TO SENATE

A committee investigator was sent to Cincinnati. He found that the majority of the Government inspectors looked to the Senate to correct a situation which they had lost hope of having corrected by Curtiss-Wright. In fact, one of the inspectors broke down and cried as he told his story, saying that he had two nephews in the Air Forces. Before our investigator had finished, not only a majority of the Government inspectors, but also a number of the Curtiss-Wright inspectors, made the same charge; namely, that the inspectors were not being permitted to reject parts and engines that failed to conform to specifications.

Some of the Curtiss-Wright personnel, who claimed to have made an investigation, have since been discharged or removed from their jobs, and the Army has instituted court-martial proceedings against some of the officers upon whom it relied for an investigation.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the very same thing has happened at Buffalo. The men who complained about what the Curtiss-Wright officials were doing there have been summarily fired.

Mr. President, who controls that corporation at Buffalo? I hold in my hand a list of the board of directors. It shows that the president is Mr. Guy W. Vaughan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. He is chairman and president.

Next on the list of the directors is Edward R. Tinker, of Syosset, Long Island, N. Y.

Third on the list is William F. Carey, 450 East Fifty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

The names and addresses of the other directors are as follows:

Edgar S. Bloom, 1020 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

J. R. Dillon, 322 Corlies Avenue, Pelham, N. Y.

J. S. Allard, 25 Edgewood Lane, Bronxville, N. Y.

E. S. Cramer, 311 West Twenty-third Street, New York, N. Y.

J. A. B. Smith, 1170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. W. Loos, 225 East Seventy-third Street, New York, N. Y.

J. C. Willson, Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

Burdette S. Wright, 4931 Sheridan Drive, Williamsville, N. Y.

R. L. Earle, Essex Falls, N. J. That is right across the Hudson River from New York.

S. R. Reed, Englewood, N. J. That is about a 20-minute ride from New York.

M. B. Gordon, Paterson, N. J. That is a few miles farther from New York.

Charles A. Dana, The Homestead, Wilton, Conn. That is a few miles out of New York, so those who live there do not have to pay income taxes in New York, but can escape them by moving to Connecticut. I am not certain whether this man moved there for that purpose; I am not acquainted with him.

Daniel M. Sheaffer, Philadelphia, Pa.

W. H. Smith, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

John C. Cowden, Bel Air, Calif.

It is to be noted that only one of the directors comes from California.

So, Mr. President, we have Wall Street, in the ownership of the Curtiss-Wright Co., apparently perfectly willing to have poor materials put into the planes, and perfectly willing to discharge any inspector who complains that the materials used are defective, and yet the company is building airplanes which American boys are attempting to fly all over the United States. Seventeen thousand five hundred already have died. More, I repeat, than three times as many as the number of United States pilots who have died in all theaters of the war.

Yet, Mr. President, more than 18 months have passed since Senator Truman delivered that speech telling what was done in Cincinnati. In a moment I shall show that not one of those men has been put into the penitentiary, where he belongs, nor has the company paid any fine.

Senator Truman continued his speech at that time—in October 1943—as follows:

The Army and the committee are in substantial agreement that the situation at the Lockland plant was extremely bad and required drastic corrective action.

Gen. H. H. Arnold, commander of the Army Air Force, recently complimented me on the accomplishments of the committee at Lockland and informed me that the committee's action had been of great assistance to the Army Air Force.

ISSUED REPORT

The committee issued a report to the Senate to force Curtiss-Wright and the Army to take further additional corrective action, and to take it promptly.

The committee found no evidence that Curtiss-Wright was deliberately disregarding the specifications for the purpose of sabotage. We understood that the reason why some of its officials wanted lax inspection was that they were not able to produce engines in quantity that conformed to the specifications. For these reasons, the committee expected that the rate of production of engines would fall off when the plant was required to produce engines which conformed to Curtiss-Wright's own specifications.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that the Curtiss-Wright Corporation drew up its own specifications, and then it discharged inspectors who found that its own specifications were not being lived up to by that company.

Most newspapers and radio commentators—

Senator Truman continued—

thoroughly understood this situation, but a few of them allowed themselves to be confused by Curtiss-Wright officials, who wanted to make it appear that it was the Senate, and not themselves, who should be censured for their inability or unwillingness to produce airplane parts and engines in accordance with their own specifications.

Six weeks after the committee had issued its aircraft report—

This is Senator Truman speaking—

Curtiss-Wright had still failed to provide good management at the Lockland plant, and the situation was still so bad as to require both the Army and the Truman Committee to give the company the ultimatum "produce or get out."

Mr. President, at about this same time action was brought by the United States Government. What kind of an action

was it? Was anybody arrested? No; it was simply a suit for damages against the firm for selling the Government for use by the armed forces airplane motors which the Truman report said was "defective, substandard, and unsatisfactory." The boys who died are still dead, but the men responsible for their deaths are permitted today to sit in Washington in high command.

In the Washington Star for July 10, 1943, there appears this story:

UNITED STATES SUES WRIGHT FIRM ON CHARGE OF SELLING DEFECTIVE ENGINES

(By the Associated Press)

TRENTON, N. J., July 10.—The Federal Government, charging the Wright Aeronautical Corporation with selling to the Government airplane motor materials which allegedly were "defective, substandard, and unsatisfactory," brought suit for damages against the firm and eight of its officers today in a complaint filed in Federal District Court by United States Attorney Charles M. Phillips.

The corporation, which has its principal office at Paterson, N. J., is one of the Nation's largest holders of war contracts. The firm is a wholly owned subsidiary of Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

The allegedly defective and substandard materials were delivered under Government contracts awarded to the Lockland (Ohio) plant of the corporation for the manufacture of air-cooled airplane engines, the complaint said.

Charles D. Hyman, assistant United States attorney, said that if the suit was successful, the defendants would be subject to a fine of \$2,000—

Just think of it—

for each transaction which the court held was a violation of Federal law prohibiting "false, fraudulent, and fictitious claims" against the Government. Bills for the allegedly unsatisfactory materials constituted fraudulent claims, the Government contended in the complaint.

NO ESTIMATE OF TOTAL

Mr. Hyman said he could not estimate immediately the total possible penalty.

Named as co-defendants with the corporation were G. W. Vaughan, president and chairman of the board of directors; M. B. Gordon, vice president and general manager; Arthur McNutt, vice president in charge of engineering; G. F. Chapline, vice president in charge of sales; C. C. King, treasurer; E. S. Kramer, secretary; J. M. Scanlon, assistant secretary; J. H. Darragh, assistant secretary and treasurer.

Mr. President, in view of Curtiss-Wright's sweeping denial of startling charges concerning the Buffalo plant, Lewis Mayer, president of the International Association of Machinists who is the union chief located at this plant, issued a statement confirming the former inspector's allegations. Mr. Mayer not only confirmed the charges but accused the Army of being at fault for these conditions because, as he said, its representatives at the plant admitted these "serious conditions" to be true but refused to do anything about this.

I blame the Army more than I do the company—

Mayer is quoted in the Buffalo Courier Express as saying.

Alongside of each Curtiss inspector stands an Army inspector who should catch what the Curtiss inspector misses—

The union chief added. Mr. Mayer cited as further proof the fact that my

original informer was held in the highest regard by the Army officers located at the Curtiss-Wright plant. Mr. Mayer is quoted as saying that Mr. Frank R. Hirsch, former inspector, was offered a job as Army inspector soon after he resigned from the Curtiss-Wright plant, but with the stipulation that he be removed to another factory, namely the Bell Aircraft Corporation, and not to the Curtiss-Wright plant.

According to Mr. Mayer, Hirsch refused to be a party to such an agreement, insisting that he carry on his work at Curtiss-Wright or at no place at all.

Mr. President, for many years I have been vitally interested in aviation. When I witnessed crashes day after day I wanted to find out why so many planes were being destroyed on the home front—three times as many as in the war itself. So, on October 14, 1943, I addressed a letter to Senator Truman. On October 19, 1943, he advised me as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Thank you for your letter of October 14, inquiring concerning the report of my committee on military airplane accidents. The committee has been studying this matter for some time, but due to the difficulty which it has encountered in assembling the necessary information, this inquiry has not been completed. Consequently, there will be no report in the immediate future. As soon as the committee's material is fully assembled it will, of course, make a report. I will be glad to advise you as to the approximate time as soon as it is possible to do so.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, the distinguished leader who wrote this letter is none other than the President of the United States. It is within his province to obtain any information which he desires from the War Department. As President of the United States he should have no further difficulty or encounter further delay in securing this data.

On July 10, 1943, in the report bearing his name, the now President of the United States promised the American people an enlightenment on these startling aircraft accidents. I hold in my hand the Truman report. On page 30 it reads as follows:

AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

In addition to the foregoing the committee has been engaged in a study of military plane crashes and at a subsequent date will report on this subject. The committee is concerned about the large number of such casualties, particularly in noncombat operational flights in this country.

Mr. President, that was 21 months ago, and no report has been forthcoming.

Only a week ago I lost one of my best friends in North Dakota. George Schoenberger lost a very fine son with whom I had been associated for a great many years. Mr. Schoenberger believes that his death may have taken place as a result of one of the accidents to which I have referred. However, he was killed across the water, and no definite proof is now available.

Mr. President, the Curtiss-Wright Corporation attacked the Senator for his sensational report. On July 15, 1943, Senator Truman publicly threatened the corporation that unless it cleaned

up this scandal he would make public the secret testimony on which he based his report and expose this heartbreaking situation. Why has not that secret testimony been made public? Why are these men being protected and allowed to carry on this diabolical sabotage. Every one of our boys killed by defective airplanes is another Pearl Harbor. I think it is about time for Congress to do something about this scandal. I think the Congress has a right to know the unvarnished truth concerning this situation.

I am wondering if every Member of Congress realizes the significance of these revelations. I am wondering whether or not this Congress is satisfied and willing to ignore this amazing scandal and wait until tragedy comes closer to their own homes and loved ones. I think we have waited long enough for an official explanation of these crashes. I think it is time for Congress to act. I am angered by the calloused indifference on the part of high officials of our Government to these service crashes. I am appalled and sickened by these facts. What is behind the hideous power that prevents a thorough investigation of this great American catastrophe?

Mr. President, I have been very much pleased indeed by the assurances given me by the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. Ferguson], one of the members of the Truman committee, now known as the Mead committee, that they now have in Buffalo various investigators and are making a thorough investigation of the Curtiss-Wright plant there. But, Mr. President, I submit that is not enough. I submit that on the record, the cold-blooded record, as found by Senator Truman himself, this man Wright, or the Curtiss-Wright Aeronautical Co., ought today to be separated from any connection with the service of the United States of America; that the people of this country should not tolerate a man who is responsible for the very conditions that Harry Truman found and condemned, and that that man should not hold a position under Harry Truman, the President of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PROPAGANDA, NOT FACTS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, representatives of 46 nations are engaged at San Francisco in one of the most important conferences of all time. They are proposing to frame the charter of an international organization, based on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the purpose of which is to prevent another world war. These proposals when completed will come before the Senate. Other international arrangements are being considered by many nations, and we have now before us in Congress the Bretton Woods proposals. There is also pending in the

House a measure to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of 3 years and to give additional power to reduce the tariff rates to 25 percent of those fixed in the statute. All of us have the most vital interest in these problems and the policies upon which they are based. They are, or will become, legislative matters, and they will be debated here on their merits in the light of the very best information which can be obtained by our committees.

I rise today to protest against the deliberate policy of Nation-wide propaganda adopted by the State Department and the Treasury Department with relation to these measures. It is a superpropaganda, under the direction of Mr. Archibald MacLeish, Assistant Secretary of State, and it is aimed directly at Congress. All of us have recognized the value of propaganda as a weapon of war and we have realized the necessity of improving its technique and adopting in war something of the ruthlessness of the methods pursued by Adolf Hitler. But it is time now to put an end to the theory that these methods of propaganda can be turned inward against our own people, our own institutions, and our own Congress. There have been many instances in history when victorious armies have returned home and been used to suppress the liberties of their own people. Fortunately there is no danger of that kind of thing in America; but let us be sure that a much more subtle weapon of propaganda is not used in the same way.

It is high time that the Government departments were told that they must confine themselves to presenting their cases on legislative matters to Congress and not turn the Government into a vast public-pressure group to destroy our constitutional processes. The purpose of the present campaign of the State Department is to convince Congress and the people that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are an absolute guaranty of peace, that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the Bretton Woods Act are absolutely essential to make this guaranty good; that anyone who questions the perfection of any one of the three is in favor of a third world war; that to assure peace they must be accepted without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i"; and that there is no other possible way to assure peace. I am quite willing to admit that there are good arguments for all these proposals, but even their authors do not claim the perfection which, of course, must be the claim of propaganda, if the Government indulges in it at all.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA IS ILLEGAL

As long ago as July 11, 1919, Congress passed an act intended to prohibit propaganda by executive departments. It appears now as section 201 of the Criminal Code and reads as follows:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, either before or

after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask my friend from Ohio a question in relation to the portion of the law he quoted. As he knows, the heads of some of the executive departments are getting out books which are primarily interested in furthering, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio suggested, one line of thinking. Those books are not written by the so-called authors; they are written by men who are working for the Government, in the Government, and paid by the Government, and ostensibly for propaganda purposes. Would that be a violation of the statute the Senator has cited?

Mr. TAFT. I think it might be a violation. It would depend on whether the provisions of the statute relating to the use of Government funds had been infringed, so that it would be necessary to prove that the use of such funds promoted indirectly Government propaganda to affect the Congress. I might say that this practice has become general. I happen to know of an instance coming to my attention from my own State. Here is a letter sent out by the New England Regional Office of the Office of Price Administration, addressed to newspaper editors, editorial writers, radio commentators and group leaders, whoever they may be, and trade executives. The letter is signed by the Regional Administrator, Mr. Eldon C. Shoup, and was sent broadcast. I think it is now in the record of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It reads as follows:

The attack on price control before the Senate Agricultural Committee represents one of the most vicious pressure-group tactics yet undertaken. Success of the attack would deal a body blow to price control which is so necessary to the economic life of our country.

James F. Brownlee, O. P. A. Deputy Administrator for Price, has made a reply to the charges. I am sending a portion of it to you for your information. Mr. Brownlee outlines the position of O. P. A. in relation to the meat-packing industry presenting background facts which are little known by the public.

That is broadcast throughout the whole New England district, and is a specially prepared reprint of Mr. Brownlee's testimony.

The practice has become almost universal in every department. If they have any legislation coming before Congress they send out broadcasts containing various kinds of information and they sponsor and print books.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. We know that the departments print some books, and they are authorized by the Congress to print them. The Congress makes the appropriation for the printing; but today there is no department that can print any book which Congress has not authorized and

for the printing of which it has not provided the funds.

The Senator from Wisconsin spoke about some Government books, as I understood him, which were not now being printed by the Government. I wish the Senator would specify some of the books to which he had particular reference. He spoke about books.

Mr. WILEY. It would not be difficult, but I do not want to get into that argument now.

Mr. HILL. It is all right for the Senator to rise on this floor and talk about books, and then when I ask him to specify them to say, well, it would not be difficult, but he does not care to get into that argument, and he does not even do the Senate courtesy of rising from his seat when he answers the question. The truth is that many wild and half-baked charges are made for which there is no basis in fact.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield, but I prefer to make my own statement of facts which I will support as I go along if I may. However, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin to reply to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that the acting majority leader thought that he had to take a left-handed swipe at the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator from Wisconsin will be glad to furnish at such time as he shall determine, the title of books gotten out as he stated, but it is public knowledge that there are on the pay roll of various departments and Government agencies almost 20,000 persons whose job it is to sell their line of philosophy and their dope to the public. I think the distinguished Senator from Ohio is rendering a distinct service to the public. We are engaged, as he has said, in arriving at what the truth is in relation to vital subjects such as Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and reciprocal treaties, and every day we have piles of this material coming in not only from our constituents but we have books and pamphlets such as I referred to which have been gotten out even by members of the Cabinet. How can a Cabinet officer take time to write a book? He has the experts, which experts are paid by the Government, and who are running wild throughout the country with such pieces of literature. So, I do not see that I need to apologize for my statement to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What I was seeking was the truth. I want to know the truth. I want to know the facts about these books, and I regret that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin either seems unable or unwilling to give the facts to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the act of July 11, 1919, provides a \$500 fine and 1 year imprisonment for violation by any officer or employees of the United

States. But try to get a district attorney to indict any of these gentlemen. This letter from Mr. Shoup, for instance, this O. P. A. letter, is clearly intended to effect the passage of the O. P. A. extension measure now pending before Congress. There was no other purpose in sending it out. That was its purpose. It seems to me to fall clearly within the terms of the statute, that this letter is intended and designed to influence Members of Congress in that district who favor or oppose, to vote for legislation or otherwise.

There can be little doubt that the propaganda of the State and Treasury Departments also is designed to influence Members of Congress. In fact, it is carried on on such a tremendous scale today as to destroy the whole legislative process of intelligent consideration, and threaten the independence of Congress.

I have here a large collection of pamphlets and releases issued by the departments, magazine articles by officers which have been reprinted for distribution, a reprint from the Federal Reserve Bulletin for distribution, printed copies of radio broadcasts, and innumerable speeches by officers of Executive departments. They have been widely distributed. Several pamphlets on Bretton Woods have apparently been sent to all employer-taxpayers who pay withholding taxes, in envelopes under frank of the Federal Government.

Material has been sent to clubs of all kinds and to radio commentators. Speakers are furnished to any organization that requests them. Magazine articles are planted. No one can have listened to the radio during the last 2 months without hearing a constant flow of propaganda clearly inspired by the Government, intended to give the impression of perfection with regard to both Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods.

Mr. President, I am not dealing with the controversy of the Senator from Alabama with the Senator from Wisconsin, but here we have a book, The Bretton Woods Proposals, printed by the Treasury. Here we have a reprint of an article Bretton Woods and Foreign Trade. Here is a reprint of an article by Henry Morgenthau, Bretton Woods and International Cooperation. Here is one The Monetary Fund: Some Criticisms Examined, by H. D. White, of the Treasury. These are all available. They are being sent out. Any Senator can go to the Treasury and obtain them, for that is where I got them.

Mr. HILL. They are not only available, but there is certainly no effort in any way whatsoever to hide the authorship.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. This propaganda is open and unashamed, and absolutely in violation of the law. Yet the Treasury has no hesitation whatever in proceeding with it.

I have a folder full of various kinds of reprints and releases of speeches. Some of the books are purely factual. No one could object to a book such as the one I hold in my hand, containing copies of articles and a statement of what happened.

Here is a book Recommendations of Economists for United States Approval of the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreements. The Treasury got them to sign a general approval and then proceeded to publish the book. I think the three pamphlets I now hold in my hand are the ones sent to all employer-taxpayers who pay withholding taxes.

Mr. WILEY. Who published those pamphlets?

Mr. TAFT. They were published by the United States Treasury, February 20. Here is an address by Dean Acheson, printed at the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Here is an address by John Parke Young, published at the United States Government Printing Office.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator hold that there can be no explanation or argument of any kind made by any governmental official in connection with the Bretton Woods agreement?

Mr. TAFT. No; I see no objection to a governmental official making a speech on the subject, and informing the people, certainly in the case of one who makes a speech in the normal course of business, but when the Treasury accumulates and has printed a large amount of such literature, and mails it broadcast throughout the country, I think that violates the act. The remainder of my remarks will be intended to indicate why I think this is propaganda and not merely a distribution of facts. If the Senator will wait, I think perhaps I may afford him some argument, and he can find probably some answer to the statements I make, but I think I can make the argument more completely in a connected way.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to wait, but if the Senator will pardon me for an interruption—

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume every one of these pamphlets, or whatever the Senator designates them to be, would have to stand upon the statements made in each and every one of them, in determining whether it violated the statute or not. It seems to me that if the Senator is to take the position that no one in the Government can say anything about the Bretton Woods agreement, with respect to what the text actually means in simple language, or if he takes the position that no one in the Government can make an argument for it and put it down on paper, then there will never go out any information, for fear that someone might be prosecuted under the section the Senator has read.

Mr. TAFT. The statute provides that Government money shall not be used to print propaganda intended to influence Congress. That is the effect of it. I maintain that this is clearly propaganda, and that the only purpose in sending it out is to influence Congress. I do not think that would be disputed by the State Department. I think Mr. MacLeish has organized a Nation-wide force for the purpose. He is sending people all over the country. He is undertaking propa-

ganda in the modern sense, with the modern technique, and with a more complete and open frankness than has previously characterized this particular job in the Government. It has been done; I do not say this is the first instance.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator object to the State or the Treasury Department giving the facts on these respective matters and making the information available to the people of the country?

Mr. TAFT. I do not object to their giving the information, certainly, but I do object to their furnishing a person arguments on one side without furnishing the arguments on the other side, and that is all this propaganda does, as all propaganda does. That is what propaganda is; it is a completely partial statement on one side of a subject, so broadcast to the people that it is swallowed without any opportunity for reply.

Mr. HILL. Let us consider the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. We know that the State Department was one of the authors of those proposals. Would the Senator expect the State Department to prepare its data on the basis that, "We will now give you the arguments for it and then set out all the arguments we can think of against it"? Is that what the Senator would have them do?

Mr. TAFT. I should think the State Department would satisfy itself with sending out the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as they are. If they furnish arguments for them, they should furnish arguments against them. The statute says that Government money shall not be spent to influence legislation pending in Congress. They should present the arguments to Congress, not send out general propaganda resulting in letters coming to Congress, designed to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress. That is clearly their purpose. There can be no question about it.

Mr. HILL. We all hope an international organization will come out of the San Francisco Conference along the lines of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, but we also know that at the present time there is no legislation dealing with that subject. The information which I have seen from the State Department dealing with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals states what the proposals are, and in some instances elaborates, perhaps, on the reasons for the different proposals. Some of them, at least, in their naked language, would not, perhaps to the average reader, show clearly exactly what the proposals seek to do.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the Senator, the statute provides that no propaganda can be issued by the Government which directly or indirectly affects legislation in the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Incidentally, legislative proposals which have not been introduced, as well as those which have been. It covers the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals as much as anything else.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator fears is that when these pamphlets go out to

the country, the country will become excited, and send Senators and Members of the House letters asking them to do this or that. I think I am correct in that.

Mr. TAFT. I think I am correct in saying that what I object to is the State Department sending throughout the United States a one-sided argument for a legislative proposal, when the statute provides that Government money shall not be used for that purpose. If there are private citizens who wish to conduct that kind of propaganda, they are free to do so, and they are free to get any such information as they want from the Secretary of State, and they are free to send out State Department speeches if they want to, but the statute provides that the Government itself shall not undertake that kind of propaganda, or use Government money for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, there might be a serious question, as I see it, as to the Government using literature of this kind, sending it to the public, and the public indirectly or directly getting it back to the Members of Congress. Apparently what the Senator fears is that someone is going to be influenced by the public with respect to Dumbarton Oaks or Bretton Woods as the result of propaganda that is being sent out directly to the people. I know the Senator from Ohio, statesman that he is, and a man who stands up to things and cares nothing about letters that come in, will not be influenced in his views or his convictions by what someone in Ohio may write him. That seems to be the complaint in the Senator's argument.

Mr. TAFT. My complaint is as to the use of the vast force of Government money to create a public opinion by a prejudiced propaganda. That is perfectly clear and definite, and the purpose is to influence Congress. No one can doubt that that is the purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that the Senator from Ohio would admit that propaganda from his State, upon a great question such as Dumbarton Oaks or Bretton Woods, could influence him. It is an admission which I did not think the Senator from Ohio would make. I knew that some Senators might fall for it, but I did not think the Senator from Ohio would.

Mr. TAFT. Unfortunately on this side of the aisle we have only a minority, and I am afraid the propaganda will affect some of the Senators on the other side. We must have some Democratic votes in order to obtain a favorable result in the Senate, and I am afraid of the influence the propaganda might have on some Senators on the other side who would otherwise vote with those on this side of the aisle.

Mr. LUCAS. From what I hear today the minority is a very vocal minority.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from Ohio advise us as to how the State Department and other agencies obtain their appropriations? Under what item do they budget or list these particular pamphlets and the work that is to be done on this propaganda?

Mr. TAFT. My recollection is, though I am not sure about it, that the State Department has a regular appropriation for printing. They can print anything they please so long as they do not violate the statute in some way. The statute provides that the money shall not be used, even though it is appropriated for printing, for the purpose of issuing propaganda dealing with measures pending before Congress and designed to influence a Member of Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would be almost certain then that they conceal the purpose for which they are going to use the money. At least they could not in connection with the Budget item intimate that they were going to use the money to violate the particular statute to which the Senator from Ohio has called attention.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know about concealing it, but they have not mentioned it to appropriation committees, so far as I know.

Mr. FERGUSON. I happen to be at the present time a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I have not seen it referred to. I am wondering how and under what guise they obtain the money they must use to send out all these pamphlets and other literature.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that the Senator from Michigan has not seen that one thing, because if he missed that it is the first thing he has missed since he has been in the Senate.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio knows that this practice has been going on almost as long as the Government has been in existence. Appropriations have been made for this particular purpose. Administrations, whether Democratic or Republican, have done this very thing before. The Senator will not deny that. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference was a most important meeting. It was most important to the peace of the world. The Bretton Woods Conference was most important to the peace of the world. Therefore, in my opinion the more information respecting those two conferences—I care not whether it is good or bad—that can be sent out to the people of America the better it will be, particularly from the standpoint of legislation, in the final analysis.

Mr. President, it seems to me that argument against Dumbarton Oaks, the great international organization toward which we are all looking forward, comes with poor grace at this particular time, especially when made on the ground that a department has sent out a little more literature than someone thinks should be sent out.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am quite willing to admit that the law has been violated for a long time, and particularly by this administration. But we have developed new techniques of propaganda in this war. It is much more dangerous than it ever has been before. Individuals have conceived the idea that they can change whole peoples and their nature, as Mr. Hitler did by his propaganda in Germany. They have learned something about what propaganda can be,

Today propaganda, in my opinion, is the greatest weapon that can be used against democratic government, and is more likely to destroy democratic government than any other process, because it strikes at the very root of democratic government, which must be based on an intelligent consideration by all the people of the problems which arise and a correct decision resulting from such intelligent consideration. Propaganda, particularly propaganda backed by the unlimited force of government funds, is more likely to destroy democracy itself from within than any other force that I can think of.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is certainly interesting to learn at this hour that the Senator from Ohio believes that propaganda is the power he most fears may destroy the democracy of America in the future. It is a far cry from the last campaign, when all I heard was "communism." I never heard anything about propaganda during that campaign.

Mr. TAFT. Communists have the most supreme technique of propaganda the world has developed, and the two go together in every instance. The Communists have developed in Russia a complete propaganda. No one in Russia can hear anything except what the Government says and what the Government wants said. So when one fears communism it is largely the effective propaganda of communism that one fears.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to know now that what the Senator fear about communism is the propaganda they spread, and not the doctrine that communism is supposed to teach the people.

Mr. TAFT. No; if the propaganda of communism were not concealed under the guise of democracy there would be no danger from communism.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not share the fear of propaganda held by the Senator from Ohio. There may be something new in this country; it may be a new technique a new political philosophy the Republicans are going to adopt, but I cannot be very much worried about it.

Mr. TAFT. I am glad the Senator has concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry I interrupted the Senator, because I know exactly how the Senator feels about Senators on this side of the aisle interrupting him. He always has such an important statement to make that anyone who interrupts him always does him an injustice.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, one of the obvious results of this propaganda has been the radio broadcasting. How it has been arranged, I do not know and I cannot say that it is illegal, but certainly many of the radio commentators have been primed, they have been filled up with the perfection of these various proposals, and we find them on every possible program.

A very minor example of this broadcasting technique might have been heard on Friday, April 6, over the Bessie Beatty program on the Mutual Broadcasting System, one of the most influential daytime programs. It comes on at 11

o'clock in the morning. Miss Beatty, who I feel confident was an entirely innocent vehicle for this process, announced that her guest for that day would be Mr. Leo Cherne, great authority on Bretton Woods. She intimated that she would like to have her listeners write her their opinions about Bretton Woods, and hinted also that they might write their Representatives and Senators in Washington. Then Mr. Cherne, who is the economic analyst and commentator for the Mutual Broadcasting System, talked about Bretton Woods in the usual generalities. He did not happen to mention the little fact that it would cost us \$6,000,000,000, nor the equally important fact that the borrowers would have a majority of the votes on the board of directors. It was the same kind of propaganda which you have heard from many other commentators, but on a program which, of course, had no relation to the subject.

In short, what the State Department is putting out and inspiring is propaganda and not facts.

I do not know how many Senators here have seen the motion picture dealing with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, entitled "Watchtower Over Tomorrow." I do not know definitely the facts relating to the preparation of this film, but I understand that it was prepared at Government expense and is for practical purposes distributed by the Government. It boosts the Dumbarton Oaks proposals through a wholly unqualified paean of praise. Critics of the plan are presented as isolationists and practically traitors to the country, who desire to promote a third world war. It is straight propaganda and not facts.

I have on my desk here a collection of documents obtained from the State Department and the Treasury, many of them distributed freely throughout the country by those departments. Perhaps the principal document dealing with Dumbarton Oaks is Department of State publication No. 2297, which is gotten up with a statement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and includes a number of leaflets entitled, "Foreign Affairs Outlines." One has an item headed, "War—How can we prevent it?" Another is headed, "Prosperity—How can we promote it?" Then the proposals are set out verbatim, but the whole collection is prepared as a prejudiced argument for the proposals. Every argument in favor is stated, and no arguments are stated against. There is the usual propaganda set-up of pictures to persuade those who will not take the trouble to read. Attempts again are made to convey an idea of perfection.

It is my present intention, Mr. President, to support the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, but certainly they are far from perfect, and many criticisms have properly been made of them which are not even suggested in these supposedly informative pamphlets. The State Department itself has accepted many amendments proposed by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], but nothing is said of those amendments in any publications of the State Department.

Take the one vital point with relation to voting power. In one of these pamphlets we find this language:

How does the plan approach the problem? 1. By dealing firmly and quickly with each dispute as it arises, using united force, if necessary, to prevent or stop armed conflict.

That simply is not the fact. By the time the veto power has been introduced into the equation there is no longer the possibility of dealing with any major dispute by the use of united force.

Again the pamphlet says:

This means that where the Council is engaged in performing its function in the peaceful settlement of disputes, no nation, large or small, would be above the law.

The fact is, Mr. President, that no law is referred to in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and their best friends have widely criticized them as omitting all reference to law and justice. Decisions are apparently to be made by the Council on the basis of political and national interest as its members think may best promote peace.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to hear the statement made by the Senator from Ohio with respect to the propaganda which goes out over the radio. We have had numerous hearings before the Committee on Interstate Commerce with reference to this very subject. I am not complaining respecting the particular point the Senator is discussing, because I have not given much thought to it. But constantly propaganda is put on the radio by men whom they claim are experienced in the particular line, whereas, as a matter of fact, if we check up on many of the columnists and others who speak on the radio, we find that they do not know anything about the subject on which they speak, they do not give the facts, and they present only one side of the issue.

I have repeatedly told the chain broadcasting companies that we can preserve a democratic republic in this country only by presenting both sides of every issue. In many instances in the past that has not been done, and it is not being done now. I suggested that the Congress would have to enact a law requiring them to present both sides of every issue. In short, if they wished to present on a program a person who would give only one side of a subject, such a law would force them to present someone else who would speak on the other side of the subject.

We talk about democracy and we talk about what Hitler has done and what Mussolini has done and what Stalin has done. Of course, they have been able to maintain their dictatorships in those countries by constantly presenting to their people, over the radio, in the press, and in motion pictures, merely the side of the issue which they wished them to hear or read about.

I say that when such propaganda is issued, a great disservice is done to the people of America. Unless that practice is stopped, and unless those who control such programs begin to present both sides of every subject they deal with, I

shall attempt to have the Congress enact legislation which will compel them to do it. I hesitate to take such steps, and, of course, it is obvious that the enactment of such legislation would be quite difficult.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will do so, because the radio is one of the instrumentalities by which propaganda has become of very much greater importance than it has ever been before, and a much more effective weapon and, incidentally, a weapon which is much more difficult to control.

As I have said, I do not think the statement made in the pamphlets that the plan will enable them to "deal firmly and quickly with each dispute as it arises, using united force if necessary to prevent or stop armed conflict" is true. The voting restrictions are such that united force cannot be used against any one of the five great nations or against any satellite of the great nations, although these are the only nations likely to start a serious war.

Mr. President, Dumbarton Oaks may be desirable; in fact, my own intention is to support it. I think the getting together of people who sit down seriously to consider every threat to peace and to try to meet it in advance is a great advantage, but certainly it has none of the perfection and none of the idealism which are stated in the publication issued by the State Department, Publication No. 2300. That publication boasts that it is giving "factual information for American groups interested in studying and discussing these vital policies in their own way." As a matter of fact, these publications are propaganda, not "factual information."

One of the vitally important factors bearing on the question of the effectiveness of the United Nations organization is the political set-up of the world. The supporters of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals must all admit that the chance for their promoting peace is considerably reduced if we leave a lot of political sore spots throughout the world, like Poland, the Baltic States, and other peoples under the domination of alien nations. None of these State Department pamphlets contains any reference to the agreements reached at Yalta regarding the disposition of these minor countries or the creation of spheres of influence in Europe or Asia. Yet these are vital facts which any intelligent person must discuss in connection with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

As a matter of fact, it has been clearly pointed out in the press that the administration and the State Department have throughout all of these international meetings concealed the facts, not only from the public at large but from Congress and many executive officials. The omission to state essential facts is the best evidence of propaganda. It interferes with attempts to improve the various proposals and thereby increase the chance of promoting peace in the future. As a result of the State Department propaganda, I have received many letters criticizing the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] for daring to suggest amendments to this so-called perfect

plan. The writers of the letters apparently did not know that most of his amendments have been accepted by the State Department itself.

BRETTON WOODS PROPOSALS ARE MISREPRESENTED

Mr. President, the documents in favor of Bretton Woods emanating from the Treasury and the State Department are just as one-sided as those relating to the United Nations. Favorable points are stressed; defects are ignored or played down.

In all the literature there is a strong desire to avoid calling attention to the cost of these proposals, and nowhere is it frankly stated that the American taxpayer is going to be called upon to put up \$6,000,000,000 of his hard-earned cash.

The little pamphlet called *Questions and Answers on the Fund and Bank*, dated March 15, 1945, was apparently distributed by the million. It is much more propaganda than it is a factual analysis. Sometimes even its facts are wrong. Thus, it is stated on page 3 that the fund "will stabilize the value of currency in terms of each other." There is very serious doubt whether it will do anything of the kind. It is said on page 8 that "no other nation can alter or, under the proposed agreement, even propose to alter the gold value of the dollar."

Of course, the other nations can propose anything, and wide power to make recommendations is given. Under section 7 of article 4, the gold values of all currencies can be proposed and even changed by action of the Board, although we would have a veto power which would be difficult to exercise. In other words, they could change it if they changed the gold value of all currency at the same time.

Although the bare facts are stated regarding the Board of Governors, the impression is certainly given that we will probably dominate the Board by the great weight of our voting power. The pamphlet wholly fails to make it clear that the control really rests in the nations who would wish to draw money from the fund and would naturally favor an easy treatment of debtors. One of the essential facts is entirely avoided, namely, that the money we put in is real money, and that most of the currency contributed by others is about equal in value to the paper on which it is printed, so that we would put in more than one-half of the real value, but we would have only 30 percent of the voting power. In short, these publications are partisan arguments. They are propaganda, not facts.

THE RECIPROCAL TREATIES AND BRETTON WOODS ARE REPRESENTED AS ESSENTIAL TO FUTURE PEACE

Mr. President, I am even more interested in the deliberate attempt of both the State Department and the Treasury to tie their economic proposals, the new Reciprocal Trade Act and the Bretton Woods agreements, into the security organization under consideration at San Francisco. The Treasury in effect takes the position that anyone who is opposed to its particular and peculiar economic nostrums is sabotaging the peace plans of San Francisco. It has gone so far as to state that San Francisco will be a

failure unless we adopt the Reciprocal Trade Act and the Bretton Woods agreements.

I do not wish to depreciate the importance of economic policy in the promotion of peace, but I do seriously question whether all these economic measures have any immediate relation to the political organization for peace now being discussed at San Francisco. I think it is important for the cause of peace to remove economic sore spots throughout the world. But it is even more important to remove political sore spots and to do away with the domination by other nations of subjected peoples who long to be free. Yet we find the State Department proceeding blandly with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, based on a world of political sore spots, at the same time that it denounces anyone who says that it is possible to secure peace without eliminating the economic sore spots.

Furthermore, it is very difficult to show that free trade throughout the world is the best method of eliminating economic sore spots. Certainly it is a very controversial subject and has been such for many years. In fact, unlimited competition between nations, which would be brought about by free trade, has produced more friction in the past than it has produced good feeling. The argument for free trade has been an economic argument, not a peace argument. The desire to extend trade was the principal reason for the growth of the British Empire and of imperialism in general throughout the world. There is little evidence that nations have been hampered in the past by inability to obtain raw materials, for instance, in any part of the world. There are many other methods besides free trade to be considered in connection with the assistance of particular nations which find themselves in economic difficulty and which may, therefore, find themselves to be economic sore spots. In fact, complete free trade might leave some of the poorer nations even less able to compete in foreign markets than they are today.

If we find a nation in want, and if we wish to assist it in increasing its exports so its people can be fed and its raw materials purchased, there may be many ways to accomplish that purpose directly—by agreeing to accept its exports under special treaties, for instance. At Dumbarton Oaks we are setting up an economic and social council to consider the economic ills of the world. Surely we might wait until this council is able to study particular situations before we determine the best cure for economic troubles. But the propaganda of the State Department maintains that anyone who opposes the new Reciprocal Trade Act, which is practically free trade, or the Bretton Woods agreements, is sabotaging the peace. Thus, in a release recently made by the Honorable Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, it is said:

Without international collaboration in the economic and financial fields, organization for security in other fields will not assure us a lasting peace. That is why the Bretton Woods proposals are of such major significance. They are an attempt at international organization in the field of money and finance, as a part of a whole. If we permit

this fact to be obscured by disagreement over details, we will have failed to meet the responsibilities of the issues before us.

In short, we cannot change a word in these agreements, because any changes could be only details, so we are told.

In a broadcast made on March 10, 1945, by the State Department—I do not know whether it was paid for with Government money—and participated in by Messrs. MacLeish, Acheson, and Clayton, all arguing with each other on the same side, Mr. Acheson said:

The Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods proposals are two basic steps toward world peace.

Mr. Clayton said:

You can't have genuine peace without healthy world trade.

Which to Mr. Clayton means free trade.

The whole broadcast was to give the impression that only by adopting the Reciprocal Trade Act and the Bretton Woods agreements could we possibly give effect to the San Francisco agreements for peace.

On April 4, 1945, in a speech to the Academy of Political Science, Mr. Edward S. Mason, of the State Department, Mr. Acheson's deputy, said:

Without Bretton Woods the prospects of a broad program of world collaboration for peace and plenty in our time would be dim indeed.

Mr. John Parke Young, an adviser in the same department, on February 28, 1945, said:

Failure on our part to participate in the Bretton Woods proposals would greatly prejudice solutions in other fields and would lead nations to look to their own devices and to adopt practices seriously damaging to this country and to the world generally.

Mr. President, as a matter of fact the Bretton Woods agreements present a completely novel and controversial scheme invented by John Maynard Keynes and Harry D. White, of the Treasury. There is nothing to show that it will work. There is nothing to show that it is any more likely to produce peace than war. As a matter of fact, an official international organization of this kind attempting to control the currencies of the world is perhaps more likely to produce international friction than it is to allay it, because it tries to keep countries from doing things which they believe they should do in their own interest, and threatens them with economic penalties if they fail to follow the wishes of the Council. Its relation to peace is distant and indirect.

There may be many other methods to cure economic ills which might produce war. For instance, the loans in reasonable amounts which we ought to make can certainly be made just as effectively through the Export-Import Bank. Many bankers and economists believe the whole exchange problem can be better settled by informal agreements between key countries gradually spreading out to solve the more difficult problems.

I do not purport to say which method is right and which is wrong, but I do say that the attempt to represent these particular extremes as being absolutely essential to the success of the Dumbarton

Oaks agreement is completely to misrepresent the facts.

The people of this country are determined to set up the best possible organization to secure peace, and progress is being made at San Francisco. Far from assisting that movement, the insistence of the State Department on tying to its tail the two economic measures now pending before Congress is much more likely to provoke widespread opposition to the results achieved at San Francisco. In my opinion, whatever agreement is reached there will be approved later by Congress. I hope the language of it will prove of real value and helpfulness to the cause of peace.

A great many of the people of this country—I believe a majority of them—are opposed to free trade and to the attempt to enlarge the reciprocal trade authority. A large number of people doubt the wisdom of Bretton Woods. Why make it more difficult to secure approval for Dumbarton Oaks by insisting that the three be tied together. These economic proposals must stand on their own feet. They must be argued on their merits and in the light of the evidence placed before Congress. Whether they contribute to peace or not can be argued at that time. But the State Department policy is actually hindering success at San Francisco.

In conclusion I wish to insist again that the State Department has no business to be setting up a department of propaganda, the effect of which is not only calculated, but actually designed, to remove opposition in Congress. If the projects which are presented to Congress cannot stand on their own feet and be supported by logical arguments presented in a reasonable way, then they ought not to be adopted. If they are not projects which will appeal to the people over a long period, they ought not to be pushed through under the weight of a vast publicity organization. The success of democratic government depends on the intelligent consideration of every project by the people and their representatives, after hearing both sides. The very basis of that government can be destroyed, as it was destroyed in Germany, by propaganda with the tremendous force of the Executive behind it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, for a long time I have favored an organization such as the one sought to be established through the Conference at Dumbarton Oaks and the one which we expect will come out of the Conference at San Francisco. But I do agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that under all circumstances we should avoid propaganda being sent out by the Government. The Senator's remarks were directed at the propaganda which is now being issued. That type of propaganda is an evil. I repeat what I have already said with reference to appropriations. If money appropriated is used for propaganda purposes by the Government, the Congress should not, under any circumstances, continue the appropriations. We do not oppose the organization to which reference has been made. But in a democracy the people are entitled to know the facts. It is not incumbent upon any department of the Government to

give out its one-sided version with respect to any subject and not reveal both sides. The people must know the facts. Congress must know all the facts before it passes legislation. What is wrong with some of the legislation passed is that it is presented by the Government. The legislation does not crystallize the ideas of the people but, instead, represents opinions of certain Government agencies themselves. The legislation should come from Congress, representing the needs of the people and not the needs of the agencies.

Propaganda put out by departments of Government can, eventually, destroy democracy itself.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the expense in connection with publications which have been sent out by the State Department, as well as those which have been sent out by the Treasury Department, and, for that matter, the publications which have been sent out by all the remaining departments of government, was specifically provided for by the Congress. Congress must appropriate money before publications can be sent out.

Mr. President, a few minutes ago we heard the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] speak with regard to this matter. It seems to me that, as is sometimes the case, he is a little behind the time. It was just a week ago today that the Senate passed House bill 2603, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. That bill provided for funds for the purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations. It further provides for funds for the purchase, rental, distribution, and operation of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rental of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services.

The bill provided on page 4 for the sum of \$379,000 for printing and binding the very publications to which the Senator from Ohio has raised objection. It seems to me that he is about a week late. As I have already said, the bill was passed only a week ago today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Alabama does not believe, does he, that the language which he has read would suspend the operation of section 201 of the Criminal Code?

Mr. HILL. I do not know that it suspends section 201 of the Criminal Code, but I believe that if the Senator from Ohio really desired to do something about this matter, 1 week ago today was the time when he should have done it. That was when the bill carrying these funds was before the Senate for consideration. The Senator then had it in his power to have proposed an amendment or to have taken some step toward correcting the situation about which he complains.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The only thing I would have done about it would be to have had included in the bill a proviso restating section 201 of the Criminal Code, and providing that none of the funds to be appropriated could be used to influence Congress. Section 201 was not suspended by the appropriation bill, and therefore there was no need to include any such proviso in that particular bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator is a good lawyer and an able Senator. He knows of many things which he might have done. For example, he could have limited or reduced the appropriations, or he could have offered to put a proviso in the bill to the effect that the funds could not be used for the purpose of sending out publications along the line about which he has complained this afternoon. When, a week ago, the Senator had his opportunity to do something, he did nothing and said nothing. By his silence he almost gave acquiescence. He has made a long speech in complaining about what was done. It is like locking the door after the horse has already been stolen from the barn.

Mr. President, I believe the Government departments should furnish information to the people of the country in order that they may be supplied with data on the various questions of importance now before them.

I also realize, Mr. President, that what is and what is not propaganda depends, in large measure, on the viewpoint of the individual. If information is sent out which is contrary to our viewpoint, we are very much disposed to believe that it is propaganda, whereas if the information sent out is in line with our viewpoint it is entirely proper; it is not propaganda; it is merely a statement of the bold, naked truth, just as the truth should be stated.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I merely wanted to ask the Senator whether he thought there was very much difference in principle between the executive departments sending out something for the purpose of propaganda, and speaking words on the floor of the Congress for purely propaganda purposes?

Mr. HILL. Of course, my distinguished friend knows that many words spoken on this floor, and many speeches made, not on this floor only, but on another floor, are what we might almost call simon-pure propaganda, delivered for purposes of propaganda.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I suppose the senior Senator from Alabama would admit there is a vast difference between doing something which is specifically prohibited by a statute of the United States and doing something which is largely the business of Senators upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. I would say, of course, there is a difference, but I add that I do not yield at all to the viewpoint of the Senator from Ohio that there is violation of law in this matter. That is the

Senator's opinion. As he says, he does not like some of this information, he disagrees with some of it. Some of the information provides arguments which are contrary to his viewpoints, his position, and the stand he has taken. I do not concede for one moment that there has been any violation of any statute at all.

The fact is that the Senator from Ohio no doubt had in his possession a week ago today most of the very information he used this afternoon, and if he had felt there was a violation of the statute, it seems to me it would have been his duty to rise when this bill was on the floor of the Senate, when it was in a position where the Senate could act on the matter, and to present the matter to the Senate, and not wait until the horse was out of the barn, and then rise and yelp and cry about it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the Senator's contention that it is the obligation of Congress to write into every appropriation bill which is passed this statutory provision which has been on our books for long years?

Mr. HILL. Of course not.

Mr. WHITE. If it is the law, then of course congressional appropriations are supposed to be within its terms and within its limitations.

Mr. HILL. That is true. The Senator knows with what a fine-tooth comb these appropriations are gone over. The Senator knows that, not so much here in the Senate, possibly, due to the fact that Members of the Senate serve on a number of different committees, but in the House of Representatives, where I had the honor of serving with the Senator, a Member of the House who is on the Committee on Appropriations serves only on that one committee.

The Senator knows that for weeks the subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations go through the appropriation bills, that they take up every item in a bill and insist on a break-down and an explanation. The Senator also knows that both political parties are represented on those subcommittees. Members of the minority sit on the House Committee on Appropriations, just as do members of the majority, and it seems passing strange, after this bill had gone through the fine-tooth comb of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, then through the House full committee, then through the House of Representatives, then through the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, then through the Senate full Committee on Appropriations, then had been brought up in the Senate and passed by the Senate, that today, after all that has transpired, after all that has taken place, the Senator should come forward with a cry of some statute being violated. I say that if the Senator thought a statute was being violated it was his business to bring the violation to the attention of the Senate of the United States just 1 week ago today,

when the appropriation bill was before the Senate. The Senate was then in a position to take action on the matter.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I shall yield, but first I want to say that in all this talk about a statute being violated, I doubt that the Senator from Ohio really was quite so serious, because, knowing him as I do, if he had been serious, certainly when this bill was before the Senate a week ago, he would have endeavored to take steps to make sure that there was no violation. I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. I was about to ask the Senator concerning this apparent conviction. The State Department and the Treasury Department have been charged and convicted by the Senator from Ohio of a deliberate purpose to influence Congress, the statement being that that was a violation of the law. Just how do we know that their action was intended for the purpose of influencing Congress? I notice that if facts are not disclosed, we hear the criticism that things are being concealed. In the same speeches we hear that the State Department is concealing something; and if the State Department sends out the information, it is trying to influence Congress. So it is an impossibility to please the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Delaware really think that the present State Department could please the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TUNNELL. No.

Mr. HILL. Surely he is optimistic if he does think so.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not think that would be possible, no matter whether they were conducting it rightly or wrongly. [Laughter.] I think it would be wrong in the eyes of the Senator from Ohio so long as there was not a Republican in charge of the State Department.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator from Delaware is absolutely correct. I know of no way by which the present State Department could please the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I did not intend to delay the Senate, but I wish to say that I agree with everything the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, says about the absolute necessity for cooperation in economic matters. I care not what kind of a political organization we may set up, I do not think it is possible to build peace in this world unless all the nations can in large measure cooperate in economic matters.

I will say, furthermore, that one of the most important organs provided for by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is the Economic and Social Council. The very purpose of that Council is to constitute, so to speak, an economic and social general headquarters, to provide a center for the coordination and harmonizing of the efforts of the different nations, a place for them to come together and to cooperate on economic and social questions, knowing that if we are to have peace, it can be built only through cooperation on economic matters, as well as cooperation on political matters. There is no arm

of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which, to my mind, is more important than the Economic and Social Council, looking toward bringing together the nations of the earth in cooperation on great, fundamental economic questions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. One of the points I made was that it seemed to me we might well leave the decision of these economic matters to that council, instead of deciding them all in advance.

Mr. HILL. The Senator was a week behind in his speech, and now he is getting behind in his economic matters. I want to see something done about these matters. I do not want to wait.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum? There are so few Senators on the other side to listen to his argument on this important matter that I thought perhaps we should have a quorum called.

Mr. HILL. I cannot yield for that purpose. I realize that the distinguished Senator would be delighted if I should stop talking, but really the Senator provides such a delightful subject, in suggesting a matter of this kind, that there is a temptation to go on. But in view of the rather subtle appeal from the Senator from Ohio that I desist, I shall desist. [Laughter.]

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Spruille Braden, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina; and

Edward A. Dow, Jr., of Nebraska, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

By Mr. WAGNER (for Mr. GREEN), from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Laurence C. Frank, of Rhode Island, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General, effective July 1, 1945, vice Frank C. Walker, resigned; and Sundry postmasters.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 7, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received May 3 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Hiram A. Boucher of Minnesota, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Theodore J. Hohenthal, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

William C. George, of the District of Columbia.

Robert K. Peyton, of New Jersey.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

David E. Lillenthal, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945. (Reappointment.)

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General, effective July 1, 1945, vice Frank C. Walker, resigned.

Joseph J. Lawler, of Pennsylvania, to be Third Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Ramsey S. Black, resigned effective May 6, 1945.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Harold H. Young, of Texas, to be Solicitor of the Department of Commerce.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Donnell Gilliam, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of North Carolina, vice Isaac M. Meekins, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Tobias E. Diamond, of Iowa, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa. (Mr. Diamond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired November 19, 1944.)

Sam M. Wear, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri, vice Maurice M. Milligan, term expired.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Jones Floyd, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas, vice Henry C. Armstrong, term expired.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Smaller War Plants Corporation: Maury Maverick, of Texas.

Patrick W. McDonough, of California.

James T. Howington, of Kentucky.

Lawrence F. Arnold, of Illinois.

C. Edward Rowe, of Massachusetts.

HONOR GRADUATES FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be second lieutenants with rank from December 1, 1944

FIELD ARTILLERY

Luther Edward Brown

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Winston Huntington Elliott

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Holmes Ely Dager (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.
Brig. Gen. Bryant Edward Moore (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Morris Hoge (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Everett Hurdiss (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Ludwell Earnest (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Matthew Devine (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. George Winifred Smythe (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Cort (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Lynn Roberts, Infantry.

Col. William Orlando Darby (captain, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Trueman Lanham (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Harlan Swartz (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Leonard Harrold (major, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Nelson Gillmore (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Burton C. Sterling, Addison, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vera S. Collier, Praco, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ARIZONA

Eleanor McCoy, Yuma, Ariz. In place of J. M. Balsz, dropped.

ARKANSAS

Dorothy A. Trammell, Everton, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CALIFORNIA

Faith R. Dotters, Daggett, Calif. In place of R. M. Salisbury, removed.

Edith A. Knudsen, Klamath, Calif. In place of E. A. Knudsen. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

John Thomas Ward, Olivehurst, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Erdman Petz, Olive View, Calif. In place of Clarence McCord. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

GEORGIA

Ruby R. Beckwith, Springfield, Ga. In place of H. N. Ramsey, retired.

Ellie A. Long, Saint Marys, Ga. In place of I. F. Arnaw, retired.

ILLINOIS

Margaret Mulvaney, Edwards, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

INDIANA

Mildred Maxedon, Hardinsburg, Ind. In place of L. M. Patton, resigned.

William L. Alvis, Patoka, Ind. In place of J. H. Witherspoon, Sr., deceased.

KANSAS

Frank H. Stelger, El Dorado, Kans. In place of J. H. Sandifer, deceased.

Lester C. Irwin, Onaga, Kans. In place of C. L. Krouse, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Thomas F. Dehey, Hinsdale, Mass. In place of C. A. Lamoureux, retired.

NEVADA

Harold Sylvester Baldwin, Henderson, Nev. Office became Presidential April 1, 1944.

NEW JERSEY

Anna M. Bryant, Lumberton, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW YORK

Mary Virginia Schremp, Maryknoll, N. Y. In place of K. A. Slattery, retired.

OHIO

Viola Smathers, Buchtel, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Anna M. Krug, Spring Valley, Ohio. In place of W. E. Alexander, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Henry R. Hare, Keota, Okla. In place of E. R. Davis, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Eva E. Taft, East Springfield, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Melvin J. Hurd, La Jose, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank W. Kebe, Moon Run, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elizabeth V. Heaps, North Bend, Pa. Office became Presidential October 1, 1944.

Mildred A. Swanson, Pittsfield, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Earl E. Koch, Wescosville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TENNESSEE

W. Coy St. John, Manchester, Tenn. In place of Hugh Doak, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Roland B. Cary, Boulder Junction, Wis. In place of D. L. Waller, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of might and of majesty, who has revealed Thyself as the supreme guiding intelligence, we pray that we may be filled with a sense of Thy divine sovereignty, ruling, not with arbitrary power, but with the gracious wisdom of a Heavenly Father whose mind is too wise to err and whose heart opens with love to all our needs.

May we respond to that wisdom and that love by seeking first Thy kingdom and Thy righteousness, assured that then all things needful shall be added unto us. Help us by Thy grace to repel every willful purpose and every selfish propensity.

We fervently pray that the day may speedily dawn when the finer moral and spiritual principles of reverence and love for God and man shall become regnant in the heart of humanity. Grant us to see and understand that faith, hope, and love are the mightiest weapons in the building of a better world. May these virtues be the guiding light of our own lives.

We offer our petitions in the name of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the